LORD MAHÂVÎRA
Vol. III

Lord Mahâvîra

Vol. III

Editor
S.C. Rampuria. B.COM, L L. B.

JAIN VISHVA BHARATI INSTITUTE
LADNUN (RAJASTHAN), INDIA

Preface

Towards the end of the 4th century B.C. an ambitious young man, prince Alexander of Macedonia, was bent on conquering the world by crushing his enemies to defeat by using brute force and lethal weapons. Nearly two centuries before that, an Indian prince, Siddhartha of Kapilavastu, renounced princely comforts and preached the message of love and non-violence. At about the same time, may be a little earlier, Lord Mahavira came on the scene to propound the religion of Jainism which was based on the pillars of non-violence (ahimsa), steadfast commitment to truth (satya), control of gross physical impulses (brahmacharya) and rising above greed and the desire to possess (aparigraha). Commitment to these noble human values made Jainism a truly humanistic religion and inculcated the spirit of respect for and tolerance of other views among its followers. Rabindranath Tagore in one of his poems described this strife-torn world of to-day as a world simmering with the spirit of insane violence (hımsaya unmatta prithvi). It hardly needs to be told that in today violence-prone intolerant world, the message of Mahavira is gaining more relevance everyday. It is, therefore, most gratifying to see that the Jain Visvabharati Institute at Ladnun, Rajasthan, has taken steps to collect, compile, edit and publish the writings of various eminent scholars in the field on the lıfe and teachings of Lord Mahavira, in three volumes under the able editorship of Shri S.C. Rampuria, the present chancellor (Kuladhipati) of Jain Visvabharati and an astute scholar himself. It is also a fitting occasion to bring these volumes out during the 2600th Birth Centenary celebration of Lord Mahavira. Editing any worthy publication is a stupendous responsibility, but it becomes enormously difficult when it come's to collecting and putting together the contributions of so many luminaries in the field from both inside India and out. Unfortunately a number of dedicated and competent scholars, (like Acharya Tulsi, Hermann Jacobi, K.C. Lalwani, K.V. Mardia, B.C. Law,

Ganesh Lalwani, N.M. Tatia, G A.B. Keith, D.S. Kothari, to name a few) whose writings have been incorporated in these volumes, are no longer with us. We can only express our gratitude and indebtedness to all of them. In this highly commercialised world of to-day everything can be paid for in cash and all obligations cease to exist after the price is paid. However, in matters academic, a different norm prevails. The products of a scholar's thinking, as mirrored in his writings, are not mere commodities with a price-tag-they are the priceless treasures to be adored by the humankind in general. No words of thank can, therefore, be adequate to express our deep sense of gratitude and indebtedness to all those who have kindly contributed their highly erudite insightful papers for inclusion in these volumes, gave us unstinted help in the past and without whose valuable advice and boundless co-operation this project might not have been successfully completed. Still, however, inadequate it may seem, we take this opportunity to express our heart-felt thanks to all these scholars whose help we have received and still continue to receive in matters connected with the publication of these three-volumes work on Lord Mahavira.

Prof. T. K. Sarkar

CONTENTS

1

MAHÂVÎRA'S DISCOURSES*

—R. B. Pandey

Since the Jains did not accept the authority of the Vedas, nor Vedic rituals, animal sacrifices, caste system, or Brahmanic dominance, Mahâvîra had to explain the nature of life and its purpose, the nature of cosmos, a theory of knowledge, and the good way to live Elaborating on the ideas and values handed down by earlier Tirthankaras in this cosmic age, Mahâvîra expounded on these essentials in a unique system of thought within the Indian systems of philosophies which, the Jains maintain, is based on logic and experience, and is grounded on reality The essential features of this system are · (1) a pluralistic view of reality consisting of **jiva** (living beings) and **ajiva** (things without life), (2) many-sidedness of the Reality (anekantavada), limiting human knowledge to plurality of points of view and multiple perceptions (**nayavada** and **syadvada**); and (3) an ethical code of conduct consisting of **triratna** (three jewels) of right knowledge, faith and conduct involving the practice of **pancha-vrata** (five vows or virtues) Such a path will lead an individual to the attainment of kevala (spiritual perfection)

The Jains view the loka (cosmos) as everlasting, uncreated, continuously recycling itself, and is composed of independent eternal categories of jiva and ajiva The ajiva are classified as having rupa (form), e g Pudgala (matter), and arupa (without form), e g. dharma (principle of motion), adharma (principle of rest), akasa (space), and kala (time). The living beings include siddhas (perfected beings), and beings still in samsara (existential forms progressing towards liberation) They are further classified as movable beings and immovable beings Then they are

---

* Age of Gurus, Bombay, 1991

subdivided into having earth-body, water-body, plant-body, animal-body, fire-body, and wind-body.

Organic beings are again sub-divided into having one organ **(touch), two organs (touch and smell),** three organs (touch, smell and taste), four organs (touch, smell, taste, and hearing), and five organs (touch, smell, taste, hearing and sight). There are also gradations among perfected beings as existing within and beyond lesser and larger cosmic cycles. Hence Mahâvîra insists in having greatest respect for life in all forms, maintaining ahimsa paramo dharma (non-injury to the living beings is the supreme law).

The reason for the jiva to be embodied in śamsara and to be subjected to bondage to existential forms is that it is intricately enmeshed with karmic matter arising out of cumulative consequences of actions and no-actions. This karmic matter accompanies jiva as some kind of transcendental luggage. As in the law of nature, every action has consequence (or there is no action which has no consequence), so is in the realm of spirit. The pollution of consequences accumulated by jiva can only be cleared by actions in life Just as there is no way of becoming healthy by proxy, there is no way of cleaning the spiritual linen by societal or institutional action or short-cuts The way of liberating the jiva from its entanglement is by the three jewels (tri-ratna) Right Knowledge, Right Faith, and Right Conduct. Knowledge of the eternal principles without doubt or error is called Right Knowledge : belief in the eternal categories is Right Faith : and the practice of the pancha-vrata (five vows or virtues) constitutes the Right Conduct. The five virtues are :

(a) ahimsa (non-injury to the jiva)
(b) satya (truth-spealing)
(c) asteya (non-stealing)
(d) brahmacarya (celibacy)
(e) aparigraha (non-possession)

Since the Jain society is composed of only two classes, the householders and ascetics (monks and nuns), the ascetics are required to observe the vows strictly. However, the last two vows are made less rigorous for the householders by rendering celibacy

to mean marital fidelity, and non-possession to mean progressive reduction of possessions by charity.

Upon liberation, the jiva attains the state of siddha (blessedness), achieves kevala-jnana (direct and omniscient knowledge), and retains individuality. When the jivá is embodied in existential forms, its capacity for perfect knowledge is eclipsed by the media of passions and emotions caused by karmic consequences This modification of jiva's inherent capacity limits the possibility of human knowledge to a relative point of view, observing Reality tangentially. Because of this the Jain logicians recognize sapta-bhangi (seven-fold perception) by which some knowledge may be attained. Such cumulative knowledge (anekantavada) from multiple points of view (nayavada) and plurality of perceptions (syadvada) does not necessarily provide the certainty of knowledge. To take some examples .

In winter a person coming from outside into the room may find it warm, but a man who has been in it for a long time may find in non-warm at the same time, while the true character of the room may be indiscribable. Hence it is possible to predicate that, 1) the room is warm, 2) the room is not warm, 3) the room is warm-and-not-warm, and 4) the true character of the room is not describable. This gives four points of view from which the room could be predicated. Combining affirmative and negative quality succeedingly and simultaneously, the Jain logicians point out the possibility of seven points of view to predicate about the room at the same time

The fable of five blindmen trying to "know" an elephant, and making positive and negative statements about it from different points of view within the limited experience, none of which could be exclusively or completely true in regard to totality nor completely false in respect to particular aspects.

A mountain could be viewed from many points of view, not one of them need necessarily be the only or correct view. The perceptions could be vitiated by the state of mind and emotion of the perciever, or the state of the weather or the season.

Jains classify knowledge into five kinds : (1) mati (mind cognition, including memory, recognition, and induction); (2) sruti (knowledge derived through signs, symbols, mythic

consciousness, and verbal structure; (3) avadhi (clairvoyance, or direct knowledge of things at a distance in space and time); (4) manahparyaya (telepathy, or direct knowledge of the thoughts of others) , and (5) kevala-jnana (Direct comprehensive knowledge) Of these the first three are liable to error, but not the last two (Discourse on "The Road to Final Liberation").

The Selections included in this section are taken from the Jain Agama (A) Acaranga Sutra (First of the Angas), trans. Hermann Jacobi, Jain Sutras, Part I. in Sacred Books of the East, ed. F Max Muller, Oxford University Press, 1884, Vol. XXII. "Respect for Life . Knowledge of the Weapon", I I 1-7, p. 14; "Pancha Vrata · Five Vows or Virtues II. iii 15, pp. 200-210 (B) Uttaradhyayana (first of the Mula Sutras), trans Hermann Jacobi, Jain Sutras, Part II, in SBE, 1895 Vol XLV "The Young Ascetic", VI p 24-27, "The Leaf and the Tree," X. pp 41-46; and "The Road to Final Deliverance," XXVIII pp. 152-157

II. 10. i. Respect for Life : Knowledge of the Weapon[1]

FIRST LESSON

1 O long-lived (Jambusvamin[2]) ! I (Sudharman) have heard the following discourse from the venerable (Mahâvîra[3])

2 Here many do not remember whether they have descended in an eastern direction (when they were born in this world), or in a southern, or in a western, or in a northern direction, or in the direction from above, or in the direction from below, or in a direction intermediate (between the cardinal points), or in a direction intermediate between these (and the cardinal points)

3 Similarly, some do not know whether their soul is born again and again or not, nor what they were formerly, nor what they will become after having died and left this world.

4 Now this is what one should know, either by one's own knowledge or through the instruction of the highest (i e a Tirthankara), or having heard it from others that he descended in an eastern direction, or in any other direction (particularised above) Similarly, some know that their soul is born again and again, that it arrives in this or that direction, whatever direction that may be

5. He believes in soul,[4] believes in the world,[5] believes in reward,[6] believes in action (acknowledged to be our own doing in such judgments as these) . 'I did it;' 'I shall cause another to do it,' 'I shall allow another to do it.'[7] In the world, these are all the causes of sin,[8] which must be comprehended and renounced.

6. A man that does not comprehend and renounce the causes of sin, descends in a cardinal or intermediate direction, wanders to all cardinal or intermediate directions, is born again and again in manifold births, experiences all painful feelings

7. About this the Revered One has taught the truth (comprehension and renunciation). For the sake of the splendour, honour, and glory of this life, for the sake of birth, death, and final liberation, for the removal of pain, all these causes of sin are at work, which are to be comprehended and renounced in this world He who, in the world, comprehends and renounces these causes of sin, is called a reward-knowing sage (muni) Thus I say.[9]

SECOND LESSON[10]

1 The (living) world is afflicted, miserable, difficult to instruct, and without discrimination In this world full of pain, suffering by their different acts, see the benighted ones cause great pain

2 See ! there are beings individually embodied (in earth, not one all-soul) See ! there are men who control themselves, (whilst others only) pretend to be houseless (i.e. monks such as the Bauddhas, whose conduct differs not from that of householders), because one destroys this (earth-body) by bad and injurious doings, and many other beings, besides, which he hurts by means of earth, through his doing acts relating to earth.

3. About this the Revered One has taught the truth . for the sake of the splendour, honour, and glory of this life, for the sake of birth, death, and final liberation, for the removal of pain, man acts sinfully towards earth, or causes others to act so, or allows others to act so. This deprives him of happiness and perfect wisdom. About this he is informed when he has understood or heard, either from the Revered One or from the monks, the faith to be coveted.

4. There are some who, of a truth, know this (i.e. injuring) to be the bondage, the delusion, the death, the hell. For this[11] a man is longing when he destroys this (earth-body) by bad, injurious doings, and many other beings, besides, which he hurts by means of earth, through his doing acts relating to earth. Thus I say.

5. As somebody may cut or strike a blind man (who cannot see the wound), as somebody may cut or strike the foot, the ankle, the knee, the thigh, the hip, the navel, the belly, the flank, the back, the bosom, the heart, the breast, the neck, the arm, the finger, the nail, the eye, the brow, the forehead, the head, as some kill (openly), as some extirpate (secretly), (thus the earth-bodies are cut, struck, and killed though their feeling is not manifest).

6 He who injures these (earth-bodies) does not comprehend and renounce the sinful acts; he who does not injure these, comprehends and renounces the sinful acts. Knowing them, a wise man should not act sinfully towards earth, nor cause others to act so, nor allow others to act so. He who knows these causes of sin relating to earth, is called a reward-knowing sage Thus I say.

THIRD LESSON[12]

1 (Thus I say) : He who acts rightly, who does pious work, who practises on deceit, is called houseless

2 One should, conquering the world, persevere in that (vigour of) faith which one had on the entrance in the order; the heroes (of faith), humbly bent, (should retain their belief in) the illustrious road (to final liberation) and in the world (of water-bodies), having rightly comprehended them through the instruction (of Mahâvîra), (they should retain) that which causes no danger (i e. self-control). Thus I say.

3. A man should not (himself) deny the world of (water-bodies), nor should he deny the self. He who denies the world (of water-bodies), denies the self; and he who denies the self, denies the world of (water-bodies).

4. See ! there are men who control themselves; others pretend only to be houseless; for one destroys this (water-body) by bad, injurious doings, and many other beings, besides, which

he hurts by means of water, through his doing acts relating to water.

5. About this the Revered One has taught the truth : for the sake of the splendour, honour, and glory of this life, for the sake of birth, death, and final liberation, for the removal of pain, man acts sinfully towards water, or causes others to act so, or allows others to act so.

6. This deprives him of happiness and perfect wisdom. About this he is informed when he has understood and heard from the Revered One, or from the monks, the faith to be coveted. There are some who, of a truth, know this (i.e. injuring) to be the bondage, the delusion, the death, the hell. For this a man is longing when he destorys this (water-body) by bad and injurious doings, and many other beings, besides, which he hurts by means of water, through his doing acts relating to water. Thus I say.

7. There are beings living in water, many lives; of a truth, to the monks water has been declared to be living matter. See ! considering the injuries (done to water-bodies), those acts (which are injuries, but must be done before the use of water, e.g. straining) have been distinctly declared. Moreover he (who uses water which is not strained) takes away what has not been given (i e the bodies of water-lives). (A Bauddha will object) : 'We have permission, we have permission to drink it, or (to take it) for toilet purposes.' Thus they destroy by various injuries (the water-bodies) But in this their doctrine is of no authority.

He who injures these (water-bodies) does not comprehend and renounce the sinful acts; he who does not injure these, comprehends and renounces the sinful acts.

8. Knowing them, a wise man should not act sinfully towards water, nor cause others to act so, nor allow others to act so. He who knows these causes of sin relating to water, is called a reward-knowing sage. Thus I say.

FOURTH LESSON

1. (Thus I say) : A man should not, of his own accord, deny the world (of fire-bodies), nor should he deny the self. He who

denies the world (of fire-bodies), denies the self; and he who denies the self, denies the world (of fire-bodies)

2. He who knows that (viz. fire) through which injury is done to the long-living bodies (i.e. plants)[13], knows also that which does no injury (i.e. control); and he who knows that which does no injury, knows also that through which no injury is done to the long-living bodies

3. This has been seen by the heroes (of faith) who conquered ignorance, for they control themselves, always exert themselves, always mind their duty He who is unmindful of duty, and desiring of the qualities (i e. of the pleasure and profit which may be derived from the elements) is called the torment[14] (of living beings). Knowing this, a wise man (resolves), 'Now (I shall do) no more what I used to do wantonly before.'

4. See ! there are men who control themselves, others pretend only to be houseless; for one destroys this (fire-body) by bad and injurious doings, and many other beings, besides, which he hurts by means of fire, through his doing acts relating to fire. About this the Revered One has taught the truth · for the sake of the splendour, honour, and glory of this life, for the sake of birth, death, and final liberation, for the removal of pain, man acts sinfully towards fire, or causes others to act so, or allows others to act so

5. This deprives him of happiness and perfect wisdom. About this he is informed when he has understood, or heard from the Revered One or from the monks, the faith to be coveted There are some who, of a truth, know this (i e injuring) to be the bondage, the delusion, the death, the hell For this a man is longing, when he destroys this (fire-body) by bad and injurious doings, and many other beings, besides, which he hurts by means of fire, through his doing acts relating to fire. Thus I say.

6 There are beings living in the earth, living in grass, living on leaves, living in wood, living in cowdung, living in dust-heaps, jumping beings which coming near (fire) fall into it. Some, certainly, touched by fire, shrivel up; those which shrivel up there, lose their sense there, those which lose their sense there, die there

7 He who injures these (fire-bodies) does not comprehend and renounce the sinful acts; he who does not injure these,

comprehends and renounces the sinful acts. Knowing them, a wise man should not act sinfully towards fire, nor cause others to act so, nor allow others to act so. He who knows the causes of sin relating to fire, is called a reward-knowing sage. Thus I say.

FIFTH LESSON[15]

1. 'I shall not do (acts relating to plants) after having entered the order, having recognised (the truth about these acts), and having conceived that which is free from danger (i.e. control).'

He who does no acts (relating to plants), has ceased from works; he who has ceased from them is called 'houseless '

2. Quality is the whirlpool (avatta = samsara), and the whirlpool is quality. Looking up, down, aside, eastward, he sees colours, hearing he hears sounds.

3. Longing upwards, down, aside, eastward, he becomes attached to colours and sounds. That is called the world; not guarded against it, not obeying the law (of the Tirthankaras), relishing the qualities, conducting himself wrongly, he will wantonly live in a house (i.e belong to the world)

4. See ! there are men who control themselves; others pretend only to be houseless, for one destroys this (body of a plant) by bad and injurious doings, and many other beings, besides, which he hurts by means of plants, through his doing acts relating to plants.

5. About this the Revered One has taught the truth for the sake of the splendour, honour, and glory of this life, for the sake of birth, death, and final liberation, for the removal of pain, man acts sinfully towards plants, or causes others to act so, or allows others to act so. This deprives him of happiness and perfect wisdom. About this he is informed when he has understood, or heard from the Revered One or from the monks, the faith to be coveted. There are some who, of a truth, know this (i e. injuring) to be the bondage, the delusion, the death, the hell. For this a man is longing when he destroys this (body of a plant) by bad and injurious doings, and many other beings, besides, which he hurts by means of plants, through his doing acts relating to plants. Thus I say.

6. As the nature of this (i.e. men) is to be born and to grow old, so is the nature of that (i.e. plants) to be born and to grow old; as this has reason, so that has reason,[16] as this falls sick when cut, so that falls sick when cut; as this needs food, so that needs food; as this will decay, so that will decay, as this is not eternal, so that is not eternal, as this takes increment, so that takes increment; as this is changing, so that is changing.

7. He who injures these (plants) does not comprehend and renounce the sinful acts; he who does not injure these, comprehends and renounces the sinful acts. Knowing them, a wise man should not act sinfully towards plants, nor cause others to act so, nor allow others to act so. He who knows these causes of sin relating to plants, is called a reward-knowing sage Thus I say.

SIXTH LESSON

1. Thus I say : There are beings called the animate, viz those who are produced 1. From eggs (birds. &c), 2. From a fetus (as elephants, &c.), 3. from a fetus with an enveloping membrane (as cows, buffaloes, &c.), 4. from fluids (as worms, &c), 5. from sweat (as bugs, lice &c.), 6. by coagulation (as locusts, ants, &c.), 7. from sprouts (as butterflies, wagtails, &c.). 8 by regeneration (men, gods, hellbeings). This is called the Samsara for the slow, for the ignorant.

2. Having well considered it, having well looked at it, I say thus . all beings, those with two, three, four senses, plants, those with five senses, and the rest of creation, (experience) individually pleasure or displeasure, pain, great terror, and unhappiness Beings are filled with alarm from all directions and in all directions. See ! there the benighted ones cause great pain. See ! there are beings individually embodied.

3 See ! there are men who control themselves; others pretend only to be houseless, for one destroys this (body of an animal) by bad and injurious doings, and many other beings, besides, which he hurts by means of animals, through his doing acts relating to animals.

4 About this the Revered One has taught the truth · for the sake of the splendour, honour, and glory of this life, for the sake of birth, death, and final liberation, for the removal of pain, man acts

sinfully towards animals, or causes others to act so, or allows others to act so. This deprives him of happiness and perfect wisdom. About this he is informed, when he has understood, or heard from the Revered One or from the monks, the faith to be coveted. There are some who, of a truth, know this (i.e. injuring) to be the bondage, the delusion, the death, the hell For this a man is longing, when he injures this (body of an animal) by bad and injurious doings, and many other beings, besides, which he hurts by means of animals, through acts relating to animals. Thus I say.

5. Some slay (animals) for sacrificial purposes, some kill (animals for the sake of their skin, some kill (them) for the sake of their flesh, some kill them for the sake of their blood ; thus for the sake of their heart, their bile, the feathers of their tail, their big or small horns, their teeth, their tusks, their nails, their sinews, their bones,[17] with a purpose or without a purpose Some kill animals because they have been wounded by them, or are wounded, or will be wounded.

6 He who injures these (animals) does not comprehend and renounce the sinful acts , he who does not injure these, comprehends and renounces the sinful acts. Knowing them, a wise man should not act sinfully towards animals, nor cause others to act so, nor allow others to act so. He who knows these causes of sin relating to animals, is called a reward-knowing sage Thus I say.

SEVENTH LESSON

1. He who is averse from (all actions relating to) wind, knows affliction. Knowing what is bad, he who knows it with regard to himself, knows it with regard to (the world) outside; and he who knows it with regard to (the world) outside, knows it with regard to himself : this reciprocity (between himself and) others (one should mind). Those who are appeased, who are free from passion, do not desire to live

2. See ! there are men who control themselves; others pretend only to be houseless, for one destroys this (wind-body) by bad and injurious doings, and many other beings, besides, which he hurts by means of wind, through his doing acts relating to wind.

3. About this the Revered One has taught the truth : for the sake of the splendour, honour, and glory of this life, for the sake of birth, death, and final liberation, for the removal of pain, man acts sinfully towards wind, or causes others to act so, or allows others to act so. This deprives him of happiness and perfect wisdom. About this he is informed when he has understood, or heard from the Revered One or from the monks, the faith to be coveted. There are some who, of a truth, know this to be the bondage, the delusion, the death, the hell For this a man is longing when he destroys this (wind-body) by bad and injurious acts, and many other beings, besides, which he hurts by means of wind, through his doing acts relating to wind Thus I say

4 There are jumping beings which, coming near wind, fall into it Some, certainly, touched by wind, shrivel up; those which shrivel up there, lose their sense there, those which lose their sense there, die there

5. He who injures these (wind-bodies) does not comprehend and renounce the sinful acts, he who does not injure these, comprehends and renounces the sinful acts Knowing them, a wise man should not act sinfully towards wind, nor cause others to act so, nor allow others to act so. He who knows these causes of sin relating to wind, is called a reward-knowing sage Thus I say

6 Be aware that about this (wind-body) too those are involved in sin who delight not in the right conduct, and, though doing acts, talk about religious discipline, who conducting themselves according to their own will, pursuing sensual pleasures, and engaging in acts, are addicted to worldliness He who has the true knowledge about all things, will commit no sinful act, nor cause others to do so, &c

7. Knowing them, a wise man should not act sinfully towards the aggregate of six (kinds of) lives, nor cause others to act so, nor allow others to act so He who knows these causes of sin relating to the aggregate of the six (kinds of) lives, is called a reward-knowing sage Thus I say

† The sketch of Mahavira's life provided in this section of Acaranga (1st Anga) was developed into a biography in the Kalpa Sutra by Bhadrabahu (tr H Jacobi, Jain Sutras, Part II, SBEXXII, 1884)

II. 10. ii. Pancha Vrata : Five Vows or Virtues

ACARANGA SUTRA*

23. When the Venerable Ascetic Mahâvîra had adopted the holy conduct which produced that state of soul in which the reward of former actions is temporarily counteracted, he reached the knowledge called Manahparyaya[18] by which he knew the thoughts of all sentient beings, with five organs, which are not defective, and possess a developed intellect, (living) in the two and a half continents and the two oceans Then he formed the following resolution · I shall for twelve years neglect my body and abandon the care of it , I shall with equanimity bear, undergo, and suffer all calamities arising from divine powers, men or animals.[19]

24 The Venerable Ascetic Mahâvîra having formed this resolution, and neglecting, his body, arrived in the village Kummara when only one Muhurta of the day remained. Neglecting his body, the Venerable Ascetic Mahâvîra meditated on his Self, in blameless lodgings, in blameless wandering, in restraint, kindness, avoidance of sinful influence (samvara), chaste life, in patience, freedom from passion, contentment , control, circumspectness, practising religious postures and acts; walking the path of Niravana and liberation, which is the fruit of good conduct Living thus he with equanimity bore, endured, sustained, and suffered all calamities arising from divine powers, men, and animals, with undisturbed and unafflicted mind, careful of body, speech, and mind.

25 The Venerable Ascetic Mahâvîra passed twelve years in this way of life, during the thirteenth year in the second month of summer, in the fourth fortnight, the light (fortnight) of Vaisakha, on its tenth day, called Suvrata, in the Muhurta called Vijaya, while the moon was in conjunction with the asterism Uttaraphalguni, when the shadow had turned towards the east, and the first wake was over, outside of the town Jambhika-grama,[20] on the northern bank of the river Rijupalika,[21] in the field of the householder Samaga, in a north-eastern direction from an old temple,[22] not far from a Sal tree, in a squatting position with joined heels exposing himself to the heat of the sun, with the knees high and the head low, in deep meditation, in the

midst of abstract meditation, he reached the Nirvana,[23] the complete and full, the unobstructed, unimpeded, infinite and supreme, best knowledge and intuition, called Kevala.

26. When the Venerable One had become an Arhat and Jina, he was a kevalin, omniscient and comprehending all objects, he knew all conditions of the world, of gods, men, and demons; whence they come, where they go, whether they are born as men or animals (kyavana), or become gods or hell-beings (upapada); their food, drink, doings, desires, open and secret deeds, their conversation and gossip, and the thoughts of their minds; he saw and knew all conditions in the whole world of all living beings.

27. On the day when the Venerable Ascetic Mahâvîra reached the Kevala, the gods (of the four orders of) Bhavanapatis, Vyantaras, Jyotishkas, and Vimanavasins descended from, and ascended to heaven, &c (as on the moment of his birth)

28. Then when the Venerable Ascetic Mahâvîra had reached the highest knowledge and intuition, he reflected on himself and the world · first he taught the law to the gods, afterwards to men.

29. The Venerable Ascetic Mahâvîra endowed with the highest knowledge and intuition taught the five great vows, with their clauses,[24] the six classes of lives to the Sramanas and Nirgrantnas, to Gautama, &c.

The six classes of lives are earth-body, &c. (down to) animals.

i. The first great vow, Sir, runs thus . Ahimsa (non-injury)

I renounce all killing of beings, whether subtile or gross, whether movable or immovable. Nor shall I myself kill living beings (nor cause others to do it, nor consent to it). As long as I live, I confess and blame, repent and exempt myself of these sins, in the thrice threefold way,[25] in mind, speech, and body.

ii. The second great vow runs thus : Satya (Truth-speaking)

I renounce all vices of lying speech (arising) from anger or greed or fear or mirth. I shall neither myself speak lies, nor cause others to speak lies, nor consent to the speaking of lies by others. I confess and blame, repent and exempt myself of these sins, in the thrice threefold way, in mind, speech and body.

iii. The third great vow runs thus · Asteya (non-stealing)

I renounce all taking of anything not given, either in a village or a town or a wood, either of little or much, of small or great, of living or lifeless things. I shall neither take myself what is not given, nor cause others to take it, nor consent to their taking it. As long as I live, I confess and blame, &c. (all down to) body.

iv. The fourth great vow runs thus : Brahmacarya (Celibacy)

I renounce all sexual pleasures, either with gods or men or animals. I shall not give way to sensuality, &c. (all as in the foregoing paragraph down to) exempt myself.

v. The fifth great vow runs thus · Aparigraha (non-possession)

I renounce all attachments,[26] whether little or much, small or great, living or lifeless; neither shall I myself form such attachments, nor cause others to do so, nor consent to their doing so, &c. (all down to) exempt myself.

He who is well provided with these great vows and their twenty-five clauses is really Houseless, if he, according to the sacred lore, the precepts, and the way correctly practises, follows, executes, explains, establishes, and according to the precept, effects them.

II. 10. iii. The Young Ascetic

(The False Ascetic)[27]

1 All men who are ignorant of the Truth are subject to pain; in the endless Samsara they suffer in many ways.

2. Therefore a wise man, who considers well the ways that lead to bondage[28] and birth, should himself search for the truth, and be kind towards all creatures.

3. 'Mother, father, daughter-in-law, brother, wife, and sons will not be able help me, when I suffer for my own deeds.'

4. This truth should be taken to heart[29] by a man of pure faith; he should (therefore) cut off greed and love, and not hanker after his former connections.

5. Cows and horses, jewels and earrings, cattle, slaves and servants : all these (possessions) you must give up in order to obtain the power of changing your form at will.[30]

6. Everything that happens to somebody, affects him personally; therefore, knowing the creatures' love of their own

self, do not deprive them of their life, but cease from endangering and combating them

7. Seeing that to accept (presents) leads to hell, one should not accept even a blade of grass cnly to preserve one's life one should eat the food that is put in one's own alms-bowl.

8. Here some are of opinion that they will be delivered from all misery by merely attending the teacher,[31] without abstaining from sins.

9 Acknowledging the truth about bondage and liberation, but talking only, not acting (in accordance with these tenets), they seek comfort for themselves in mighty words.

10. Clever talking will not work salvation; how should philosophical instruction do it ? Fools, though sinking lower and lower through their sins, believe themselves to be wise men

11 They are (going) a long way in the endless Samsara, therefore looking out carefully one should wander about carefully [32]

12. Choosing what is beyond and above (this world, viz liberation), one should never desire (wordly objects), but sustain one's body only to be able to annihilate one's Karman

13. Those will reap pains who, in thoughts, words, or acts, are attached to their body, to colours, and to forms

14. Recognising the cause of Karman, one should wander about waiting for one's death , (knowing) the permitted quantity of food and drink, one should eat (such food as has been) prepared (by the householders for their own consumption)

15 An ascetic should not lay by any store, not even so little as the grease (sticking to his alms-bowl), but as a bird with its plumage,[33] so he with his alms-bowl should wander about without desires

16 Receiving alms in a manner to avoid faults, and controlling one's self, one should wander about in a village (&c) without a fixed residence, careful among the careless one should beg one's food

17 Thus has spoken the Arhat Jnatriputra, the venerable native of Vaisali, who possesses the highest knowledge and who possesses the highest faith, who possesses (at the same time) the highest knowledge and the highest faith

Thus I say.

II. 10. v. The Road to Final Deliverance

1. Learn the true road leading to final deliverance, which the Jinas have taught; it depends on four causes and is characterised by right knowledge and faith.

2. I. Right knowledge; II. Faith; III. Conduct; and IV. Austerities; this is the road taught by the Jinas who possess the best knowledge.

3. Right knowledge, faith, conduct, and austerities, beings who follow this road, will obtain beatitude.

4. Knowledge is fivefold : 1. Sruta, knowledge derived from the sacred books; 2. Ahinibodhika, perception;[34] 3. Avadhi, supernatural knowledge; 4. Manahparyaya,[35] knowledge of the thoughts of other people; 5. Kevala, the highest, unlimited knowledge.

5. This is the fivefold knowledge. The wise ones have taught the knowledge of substances, qualities, and all developments.[36]

6 Substance is the substrate of qualities; the qualities are inherent in one susbstance; but the characteristic of developments is that they inhere in either (viz. substances or qualities)

7. Dharma, Adharma, space, time, matter, and souls (are the six kinds of substances[37]); they make up this world, as has been taught by the Jinas who possess the knowledge

8 Dharma, Adharma, and space are each one substance only; but time, matter, and souls are an infinite number of substances.

9. The characterist· of Dharma is motion, that of Adharma immobility, and that of space,[38] which contains all other substances, is to make room (for everything).[39]

10. The characteristic of time is duration,[40] that of soul the realisation[41] of knowledge, faith, happiness, and misery.

11. The characteristic of Soul is knowledge, faith, conduct, austerities, energy, and realisation (of its developments).

12. The characteristic of matter is sound, darkness, lustre (of jewels, &c.), light, shade, sunshine; colour, taste, smell, and touch.

13. The characteristic of development is singleness, separateness,[42] number, form, conjunction, and disjunction.

14. 1. Jiva, Soul; 2. ajiva, the inanimate things; 3. bandha, the binding of the soul by Karman; 4. punya, merit; 5. papa, demerit; 6. asrava, that which causes the soul to be affected by sins; 7. samvara, the prevention of asrava by watchfulness; 8. the annihilation of Karman; 9. final deliverance; these are the nine truths (or categories).

15. He who verily believes the true teaching of the (above nine) fundamental truths, possesses righteousness

16. Faith is produced by 1. nisarga, nature; 2. upadesa, instruction; 3 ajna, command, 4. sutra, study of the sutras; 5. bija, suggestion; 6. abhigama, comprehension of the meaning of the sacred lore; 7 vistara, complete course of study; 8. kriya, religious exercise; 9. samkshepa, brief expositions : 10. dharma, the Law.

17 He who truly comprehends, by a spontaneous effort of his mind,[43] (the nature of) soul, inanimate things, merit, and demerit, and who puts an end to sinful influences,[44] (believes by) nature.

18. He who spontaneously believes the four truths (explicitly mentioned in the last verse), which the Jinas have taught, (thinking) they are of this and not of a different nature, believes by nature.

19. But he who believes these truths, having learned them from somebody else, either a khadmasthat[45] or a Jina, believes by instruction

20. He who has got rid of love, hate, delusion, and ignorance, and believes because he is told to do so, believes by command.

21. He who obtains righteousness by (the study of) the Sutras, either Angas or other works,[46] believes by the study of Sutras.

22. He who by correctly comprehending one truth arrives at the comprehension of more—just as a drop of oil expands on the surface of water—believes by suggestion.

23. He who truly knows the sacred lore, viz. the eleven Angas, the Prakirnas,[47] and the Drishtivada, believes by the comprehension of the sacred lore.

24. He who understands the true nature of all substances by means of all proofs (pramana) and nayas,[48] believes by a complete course of study.

25. He who sincerely performs (all duties implied) by right knowledge, faith, and conduct, by asceticism and discipline, and by all Samitis and Guptis, believes by religious exercise.

26. He who though not versed in the sacred doctrines[49] nor acquainted with other systems,[50] holds no wrong doctrines, believes by brief exposition.

27. He who believes in the truth[51] of the realities,[52] the Sutras, and conduct, as it has been explained by the Jinas, believes by the Law.

28. Right belief depends on the acquaintance with truth,[53] on the devotion to those who know the truth, and on the avoiding of schismatical and heretical tenets.

29. There is no (right) conduct without right belief,[54] and it must be cultivated (for obtaining) right faith, righteousness and conduct originate together, or righteousness precedes (conduct).

30 Without (right) faith there is no (right) knowledge, without (right) knowledge there is no virtuous conduct,[55] without virtues there is no deliverance,[56] and without deliverance there is no perfection

31. (The excellence of faith depends on the following) eight points : 1. that one has no doubts (about the truth of the tenets); 2. that one has no preference (for heterodox tenets); 3. that one does not doubt its saving qualities;[57] 4. that one is not shaken in the right belief (because heretical sects are more prosperous); 5. that one praises (the pious); 6. that one encourages (weak brethren); 7. that one supports or loves the confessors of the Law; 8. that one endeavours to exalt it.

32–33. Conduct, which produces the destruction of all Karman, is 1. samayika, the avoidance of everything sinful; 2 khedopasthapana, the initiation of a novice; 3. pariharavisuddhika, purity produced by peculiar austerities;[58] 4. sukshma samparaya, reduction of desire; 5. akashaya yathakhyata, annihilation of sinfulness according to the precepts of the Arhats, as well in the case of a Khadmastha as of a Jina.

34. Austerities are two fold, external and internal; both external and internal austerities are sixfold

35. By knowledge one knows things, by faith one believes in them, by conduct one gets (freedom from Karman), and by austerities one reaches purity.

Having by control and austerities destroyed their Karman, great sages, whose purpose is to get rid of all misery, proceed to (perfection).

Thus I say

References

1 Ajjhayana, adhyayana The first lecture is called sattha-parinna (sastra-parijna), 'knowledge of the weapon' Weapons are divided into material weapon and weapon consisting in a state (bhava) The latter is explained to be non-control (asamyama) or the wrong use of mind, speech, and body Knowledge (parijna) is twofold comprehension and renunciation The subject of the first lecture is, therefore, the comprehension and renunciation of everything that hurts other beings

2 Jambusvamin was the disciple of Sudharman, one of the eleven chief disciples (ganadhara) of Mahâvira

3 Mahâvira had 12 disciples (ganadharas) of whom one (Gosala) abandoned the Guru In the Agama (Scriptures), there are 12 Angas (Limbs), and 12 Upangas (subsidiary Limbs) in the body of teaching Cf Jesus having 12 disciplines, and one of them (Judas) abandoning the Master

4 i e in a permanent soul, different from the body This is said against the Karvakas

5 i e the plurality of souls, not in one all-soul as the Vedantins

6 Kamma (karma) is that which darkens our intellect, &c Its result is the suffering condition of men, its cause is action (kiriya, kriya)

7 The different tenses employed in these sentences imply, according to the commentators, the acknowledgement of the reality of time, as past present, future

8 Kamma-samarambha Kamma has been explained above Samarambha, a special action (kriya), is the engaging in something blamable sayadyanushthana)

9 These words (iti bemi) stand at the end of every lesson The commentators supply them also for the beginning of each lesson

10 After the chief tenets of Jainism with regard to soul and actions have briefly been stated in the first lesson the six remaining lessons of the first lecture treat of the actions which injure the six classes of lives or souls The Jainas seem to have arrived at their concept of soul, not through the search after the Self, the self-existing unchangeable principle in the ever-changing world of phenomena, but through the perception of life For the most general Jaina term for soul is life (jiva), which is identical with self (aya, atman) There are numberless lives or souls, not only embodied in animals, men, gods, hell-beings, (tasa, trasa), and plants (vanassai, vanaspati), but also in the four elements-earth, water, fire,

wind. Earth, &c regarded as the abode of live is called earth-body, &c These bodies are only perceptible when an infinite number of them is united in one place The earth-lives, &c , possess only one organ, that of feeling, they have undeveloped (avvakta) intellect and feelings (vedana, but no limbs, &c The doctrines about these elementary lives are laid down in Bhadrabahu's Niryukti of our Sutra, and are commented upon in Silanka's great commentary of it They are very abstruse and deal in the most minute distinctions, which baffle our comprehension

11 Ikk attham The commentators think this to be a reference to the sentence, For the sake of the splendour, &c It would be more natural to connect it with the foregoing sentence, the meaning is, For bondage; &c , men commit violence, though they believe it to be for the happiness of this life.

12 The water-lives which are treated of in this lesson are, as is the case with all elementary lives, divided into three classes the sentient, the senseless, and the mixed Only that water which is the abode of senseless water-lives may be used Therefore water is to be strained before use, because the senseless lives only are belived to remain in water after that process

13 The fire-bodies live not longer than three days

14 Damda

15 The discussion of the 'wind-bodies', which should follow that of the fire-bodies, is postponed for two lessons in which the vegetable and animal world is treated of The reason for this interruption of the line of exposition is, as the commentators state, that the nature of wind, because of its invisibleness, is open to doubts, whilst plants and animals are admitted by all to be living beings, and are, therefore the best support of the hylozoistical theory That wind was not readily admitted by the ancient Indians to be a peculiar substance may still be recognised in the philosophical Sutras of the Brahmans For there it was thought necessary to discuss at length the proofs for the existence of a peculiar substance, wind It should be remarked that wind was never identified with air, and that the Jainas had not yet separated air from space

16 The plants know the seasons, for they sprout at the proper time, the Asoka buds and blooms when touched by the foot of well-attired girl, and the Vakula when watered with wine, the seed grows always upwards all this would not happen if the plants had no knowledge of the circumstances about them Such is the reasoning of the commentators

17 The word after bones (atthie) is (atthimimgae, for which buffaloes, boars, &c are killed, as the commentator states I do not know the meaning of this word which is rendered asthiminga
The sketch of Mahâvîra's life provided in this section of Acaranga (1st Anga) was developed into a biography in the *Kalpa Sutra* by Bhadrabahu (tr H Jacobi, Jain Sutras, Part II, SBE XXII, 1884)

18 Or manahparyaya

19 Cf Kalpa Sutra, 117

20 Month of May

21 Ujjupaliya in Prakrit

22 Or, a temple called Vijayavartta

23 Nivvane or nevvane, it may also be an adjective, belonging to nirvana This is of course not the final nirvana, which is reached at the dissolution of the body, but that state which the orthodox philosophers call jivanmukti

24 There are five clauses to each Vrata

25 i e, acting, a commanding, consenting, either in the past or the present or the future

26 This means the pleasure in external objects.

27 Khuddaganiyanthijjam = Kshullakanirgranthiyam. Kshullaka originally means 'small, young,' but I do not see that the contents of this lecture support this translation, though the commentators would seem to favour it

28 Devendra here quotes the following Sanskrit verse Kalatranigadam dattvana samtushtah prajapatih bhuyo-py apatyarup ena dadati galasrinkhalam. The creator was not satisfied when he had given (to man) the wife as a fetter, he added a chain round his neck in the form of children

29 Sapehae pase = svaprekshaya pasyet, he should look at it with his mind or reflectively The meaning is the same in both cases.

30 Some MSS insert here the following verse 'Movables and immovables, corn, and furniture can not deliver a man from pain, who is suffering for his deeds '

31 Avariyam vidittanam The commentator makes this out to mean . by learning only what right conduct (akankam) is, without living up to it But it is obvious that the author intends a censure upon the Jnanamarga (Path of Knowledge)

32 As usual this phrase means one should conduct one's self so as to commit no sin

33 There is a pun in the original on the word patta, which means plumes (patra) and almsbowl (Patra)

34 This is usually called Mati, and is placed before sruta The same enumeration recurs in XXXIII, 4, p 193 Umasvati in Moksha Sutra I, 14, gives the following synonyms of mati, smriti, kinta, abhinibodha

35 Manananam

36 Dravya, guna, paryaya (pajjava in Jaina Prakrit), Guna, quality, is generally not admitted by the Jainas as a separate category, see Silanka's refutation of the Vaiseshika doctrines at the end of his comments on Sutrakritanga, I, 12 (Bombay edition, p 482)

37 They are frequently called astikayas, or realities

38 It is here called nabhas instead of Akasa

39 Avagaha 40 Vartana 41 Upayoga

42 Singleness (ekatva) makes thing appear as one thin separateness (prithaktva) as different from others

43 Sahasamuiya = svavamsamudita It is usually rendered sahasammati

44 Asravasamvara, see above verse 14, 6 and 7

45 A khadmastha is one who has not yet obtained Kevala, or the highest knowledge, he is in the two gunasthanas (the fourteen stages in the development of the soul from the lowest to the highest) characterised as 1 upasantamoha, and 2 kshinamoha, viz 1 that in which delusion is only temporarily separated from the soul, and 2 that in which delusion finally destroyed

46 Bahira, apparently the same works are intended which are elsewhere called anangapravishta

47 The original has the singular

48 The seven nayas are 'points of view or principles with reference to which certain judgments are arrived at or arrangements made.' Bhandarkar, Report, p 112

49 Pravakana

50 E.g that of Kapila, &c. Comm

51. Dharma
52. Astikaya, see note on verse 7.
53 i e. true things as soul, &c
54 Samyaktva 'nghteousness '
55. Karanguna. The commentators make this a dvandva compound, and interpret karana as vratadi, and guna as pındavısuddhi, &c
56 By deliverance I have rendered moksha, and by final perfection nirvana, Moksha denotes freedom from Karman, a condition which ın Brahmanical philosophy ıs called jıvanmuktı
57 Nıvvitıgikkha = Nırvıkikitsa. According to the commentary ıt may stand for nır-vıjugupsa 'wıthout loathıng the saınts.'
58 The Dıpıka contaıns the followıng details Nine monks resolve to live together for eıghteen months They make one of theır number theır superıor, kalpasthita, four become pariharikas, and the remaınıng four serve them (anuparıharikas) After six months the parıharıkas become anuparıharıkas and vıce versa After another sıx months the kalpasthita does penance and all the other monks serve hım as anupariharikas

2

THE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL BACKGROUND OF MAHÂVÎRA'S TEACHINGS*

—Dr. N.N. Bhattacharya

A L Basham while dealing with the history of the Ajivikas suggested that the doctrines of Gosala, Purana and Pakudha were aspects of a single body of teaching[1] To us it, however, appears that this holds good in the case of all their contemporaries including the Buddha and Mahâvîra It was due to the fact that the Buddha, Mahâvîra and their contemporaries belonged to the same region and that they responded and reacted in their own ways, which were more or less similar, to the same stimuli arising out of the stupendous socio-political transformation which was taking place in eastern India in their time

Mahâvîra was born in an age when the *Janapadas* (tribal settlements) were developing into *mahajanapadas* (bigger confederacies) leading to the rise of organised states Already four *mahajanapadas* became distinguished as powerful states, and the forces behind the subsequent Magadhan imperialism could be seen Mahâvîra belonged to Vaisali[2] which was a tribal settlement belonging to confederation of tribes collectively known by the name of the Vajjis Mahâvîra's maternal uncle Cetaka was the leader of the Vijjien confederacy of tribes. The growth of Magadhan state power required annihilation of many a tribal settlement. Bimbisara, the first powerful Magadhan king, who was a senior comtemporary of Mahâvîra, did not hesitate to annex the settlements of the Angas and the Kasis; while his son Ajatasatru

---

* Read at the All India Seminar on Early Janism, Oct 17, 1979 at Punjabi University Patiala

launched a vigorous invasion against the Vajjian confederacy. In this great battle the Vajjians were exterminated and their leader Cetaka, being defeated, committed suicide by drowning. The tremendous bloodshed and massacre caused by this invasion did not escape the notice of Mahâvîra. Even the Buddha himself could not remain a loof and took great care to see that the Vajjians should remain unified and adhere strictly to their tribal norms and values for maintaining their independence in the face of Magadhan invasion. Gosala described this war in one of his eight finalities as the 'last great storm cloud' (***carimepokkhala samvatte mahamehe***) which swept away all the traditional values and social relations. The destruction of the Vajjian confederacy was not an isolated event. The Sakya tribe, to which the Buddha himself belonged, was annihilated by the Kosalan prince Vidudabha, who did not spare even women and children, and this happened before the very eyes of the Buddha Needless to say the creed of non-violence preached by these teachers was the outcome of their direct experience of gross violence through which state-power appeared in different parts of this country on the ruins of tribal equality

The rise of class society and state power in eastern India in the sixth century B.C through immense bloodshed and wholesale massacre was undoubtedly the culmination of a historical process The cause of this rise should be attributed to the production of immense social surplus and its accumulation in the hands of a few From the Upanisadic legends we came to know of the fact that kings like Janaka spent many thousands of cows for getting assurance of immortality from renowned teachers like Yajnavalkya and others. This shows the fantastic extent of social wealth that was accumulated in the hands of a few. This accumulation of surplus could be caused only in two ways, either by forcible exploitation of labour or by a revolutionary change in the mode of production. Some scholars believe that this change was due to the introduction of iron implements in the field of production.[3] So long as the mode of production cannot yield surplus, the integration of trible society remains intact, but when a qualitative change in that mode takes place, it also changes the existing social values and relations, giving rise to the growth of a

non-productive privileged class. In order to look after the interest of this class, laws are enacted, police and military systems are introduced—in other words the conception of state becomes materialized. This did not escape the notice of Mahâvîra or the Buddha as is proved by their discourses on the origin and functioning of the state.[4]

The contemporaries of the Buddha and Mahâvîra were overwhelmed by the stupendous social transformation of the age, the collapse of the tribal institutions, the rise of new values ushered in by the state-powers and the new forces of injustice and untruth--and they tried to understand the problems in their own ways. Overwhelmed by bloodshed and massacre, Purana and Pakudha thought that there was no difference between merit and demerit, between violence and non-violence. Ajita could not distinguish between the fool and the wise, for both were doomed to death, and Sanjaya preferred to keep himself silent since the deeply ingrained faiths behind the ideas were all uprooted Gosala, the leader of the Ajivikas, became a fatalist who was forced to believe that human activity could do nothing to change the course of events. Everything appeared to him to have been determined by forces of fate or destiny He died of despair and madness pinning in his delirium for the last drink (***carime pane***), the last song (***carime geye***), the last dance (***carime natte***) and the last greetings (***carime arijalikamme***)—characteristics of simple undifferentiated trible life

Most of the philosophical schools belonging to the Buddhist Purvanta and Aparanta Kalpikas which corresponded to the different groups of Akiryavadines[5] mentioned in the Jain texts were baffled. Their traditional beliefs and ideas, the values which they stood for were shattered into pieces before their very eyes The unprecedented violence and terror led them to believe that all human actions endeavours were fruitless The Adhiccasamuppannikes failed to put any trust on the law of causation; the Ajnanavadins or Amaravikkhepikas declined to give any categorical answer to the questions relating to life and universe. The followers of the various doctrines of non-action mainly speculated on what remained after the extermination of the mortal body. The extremists like the Ucchedavadins or

Ditthadhammanibbanavadins of the Buddhist texts or the Sayavadins or Samucchedavadins or Na-santiparalokavadins of the Jain texts identified body with soul and sought the ***summum bonnum*** of life in worldly pleasures, while others debated on the question of the existence of soul apart from body. All these doctrines were directly or indirectly concerned with death and annihilation.

It is against this background that Mahâvîra's sayings concerning human misery should be read. Overwhelmed by the stupendous social transformation and wholesale bloodshed of his time, Mahâvîra said :

The (living) world is afflicted, miserable, difficult to instruct, and without discrimination. In this world, full of pain, suffering by their different acts, see the benighted ones cause great pain.[6]

Regarding the cravings for wealth and power, by which the class societies are characterized, the Master said :

He who longs for the qualities (i e., greed and carnal desire), is overcome by great pain, and he is careless. (For he thinks) I have to provide for a mother, for a father, for a sister, for a wife, for sons, for daughters, for a daughter-in-law, for my friends, for near and remote relations, for my acquaintance, for different kinds of property, profit, meals and clothes. Longing for these objects, people are careless, suffer day and night, work in the right and wrong time, desire wealth and treasures, commit injuries and violent acts, direct the mind again and again, upon these injurious doings.[7]

The consequences of this accumulation of wealth, of the growth of private property, have not been overlooked by the great Master who observed .

Having acquired the wealth, employing bipeds and quadrupeds, gathering riches in the three ways, whatever his portion will be, small or great, he will desire to enjoy it. Then at one time, his manifold savings are a large treasure Then at another time his heirs divide it away, or those who are without a living steal it, or the king takes it away, or it is ruined in some way or other or it is consumed by the conflagration of the house[8]. Then after a time, he falls in sickness; those with whom he lives together, first grumble at him, and he afterwards grumbles at

them. But they cannot help thee or protect thee, canst thou help them or protect them [9]

Although Mahâvîra differed from the Buddha in many respects, the ruthless form of exploitation and misery of his age roused in him the same feelings shared by his illustrious contemporary The real economic cause of the disintegration of tribal society, the rise of new social forces and economic classes and the growth of the states on the ruins of the pre-class tribal equality did not escape their notice But at the same time they had to face the dual requirements of their age and had to act practically as the unconscious tools of history

On the one hand they had to offer to the peoples of their times a suitable illusion of ancient tribal communism which was getting trampled and undermined in reality and on the other to boost up some of the progressive features of the already established class society in public life and revive some of the beneficial aspects of tribal life in the class divided society. Both these teachers established the ***Sangha*** on 'Community of brethern' which was evidently modelled on the pattern of tribal democracies and meant to be the ideal substitute of a vanished way of life They took great care to see that the members of the order, the monks and nuns, would live a perfectly detached life, i e , detached from the great historical transformation going on in the society at large, whose course was obviously beyond their power to change

How thoroughly the pre-class tribal model was imitated by Mahâvîra in building up 'the community of brethern can be understood if we take into account the Jain rules relating to the procedure of entry into the order, the internal administration of the order and the role of private or personal property within the order. The head of the Jain ***Sangha*** was known as *Ganadhara*, meaning 'he who holds the tribe. The rituals relating to the entry into the order were almost the same as the tribal rites of initiation, meant for the entry into manhood or womanhood and instructions in tribal taboos, norms and behaviour [10] As regards the internal administration of the Sangha, everything was managed democratically by the monks. There was no such thing as private property within the ***Sangha***. The Jain monks were

forbidden (and even to this day they are) to have anything which they could call their own. This was the vow of ***Aparigraha*** originally enunciated by Parsva. According to Mahâvîra this should include not only the non-attachment to all sorts of property but also the non-attachment to all connected with the five organs of senses.[11] Even those things which the Jain monks always carried about himself as clothes, alms-bowl, medicine, broom, etc. were not regarded as his property, but as things necessary for the exercise of religious duties (***dharmapakarana***).

That the private property is the root of all evil was correctly understood by Mahâvîra. In the *Suyagado*[12] it is categorically stated that *He who owns even a small property in living or lifeless things, or consents to others holding it, will not be delivered from misery. This is the essence of Aparigreha.*[13]

Mahâvîra also understood that complete non-possession could be possible only in the case of the monks But what could be done within the order among the community of the monks, could not be done outside, i.e , among the greater section of the people. It was impossible to change the course of historical transformation, to check the growth of class society and state-power, and to bring back the good old undifferentiated life of the past once again. That is why for common persons he prescribed *Aparigrah* or non-possession as abstinence from gross greed which was attachment to gold, cattle, estate, cart, carriages, jewellery, etc. Likewise gross offence *Himsa* against living beings was understood by fettering, beating, wounding, overloading and cruelty, especially with reference to domestic animals used in agriculture and trade[14] Abstinence from all these was demanded. As Mahâvîra like his famous contemporary, had to face the dual requirement of his age, he had also to give moral support to the interest of the emergent trading class and as such did not give consent to the indiscriminate destruction of cattle wealth. But his emphasis upon the complete acceptance of the doctrine of non-violence as a distinct way of life can be perfectly understood only in terms of the immense bloodshed and wholesale massacre by which the socio-political transformation at that critical stage of Indian history was accomplished before the very eyes of the great master.

References

1. A L. Basham, History and Doctrine of the Ajıvikas London, 1951, p 18
2 Uttaradhyayana, VI 17
3 cf R S Sharma in Das Kepital Century Volume, ed M Sen and M B Rao, New Delhi 1968, pp 63 ff
4 Digha Nikaya, III, 27, Uttaradhyayana, IX 18-62 Brahmajala Sutta, Digha Nikaya I Suyagado, I 12
5 Uttaradhyayana XVIII, Thanam, ed Dhanapati 14, etc
6 Ayaro I 1, 2, 1, Sacred Books of the East XXII, P 3
7 Ibid, 1 2, 11, SBE, XXII, P. 15
8 Ibid, I 2, 3, 5, SBE XXII, P 19-20
9 Ibid, I, 2, 4 1, SBE XXII, P 21
10 N N Bhattacharyya, Indian Puberty Rites, Calcutta 1968
11 Ayaro II 15 5
12 I 1, 2, SBE, XLV p 235
13 Ayaro, II, 1, 10, 1, II, 7, 1, 1, II, 15 1 5
14 Uvasagadasao, 13 ff, Thanam, 296, Samavaya, 10

3

THE SPIRIT OF MAHÂVÎRA'S TEACHINGS*

—S. S. Raghavachar

It does credit to the traditions of Indian Culture that we are celebrating the 2500th Year of the Maha Nirvana of Lord Mahâvîra. In doing so we pay our homage to the immortal message that he bequeathed to humanity in that distant past and it is to be hoped that the recollection will somewhat penetrate to our truth-starved lives and add to the possibility of our eventual emancipation

The fundamental spirit or genius of Jainism which Mahâvîra repromulgated, augmenting it with the riches of his own personality and enlightenment, may be broadly characterized as the gospel of comprehension or enlargement. The logic of this gospel enters into every sphere of Jaina philosophy and Religion. It is a worthy endeavour to trace the working of the principle of comprehension in the various fields of its application.

I

A philosophy draws its vitaliy from its critique of human understanding. In this field of epistemology Jainism has advanced certain basic tenets. It is one of the chronic maladies of the human intellect that it invests a fragment of truth in its possession with absoluteness. Hence the interminable warfare of faiths and systems of philosophy. The signal service of Jaina thought is that it enunciates the method of rectifying this fallacious propensity. It formulates its unique doctrine of Anekantavada, which stands for the due recognition of all stand points and approaches to reality.

---

*Vedanta Kesari, Vol. 63, No. 11, March 1977.

The adoption of this vada rescues man's understanding from the perverse exaggeration of one-sided and extreme positions. Truth is ultimately a matter of comprehending all the partial characterizations of reality. No truth is the whole truth and there is no error other than the refusal to expand one's perspective. This wholesome insistence on intellectual breadth is a unique contribution of the Jaina theory of knowledge.

In confirmity to this basic law, Jainism enminates all one-sided methodologies in the pursuit of knowledge. It recognizes the undeniable values of empiricism but does into terminate in empiricism It exhibits a keenness to supplement sense-experience with the possible acquisition of insight through reason Sense-experience and reasoning arising from it do not exhaust the sources of human knowledge There are super-normal· perceptions also What may be called intuitive perception is also a fact The field of knowledge is conceived as including all these ways of knowing. Crowning all these is Kevala-Jnana or perfect knowledge, which is reality in the perfected personality This picture of knowledge in all this width and height brings out the spirit of comprehension in Jaina thought It needs special appreciation in sharp contrast to other systems of Indian philosophy which have upheld the exclusive validity of either sense-perception or reason or scriptural authority or mystic intuition A total mobilization of the resources of the human mind for purposes of gaining access to reality in its many-sided wholeness is a phenomenal achievement.

II

This Spirit operates with equal effectiveness in the realm of metaphysics A resolute rejection of one-sidedness is the characteristic mark of Jaina conception of reality Who have a due recognition of the reality of the temporal and changing aspects of the Cosmos as also of the timeless and unalterable entities. Reality is not broken up into atomic particulars. Nor is it misconceived as a unity excluding differentiation altogether. Substances bearing multiplicity of attributes and modifications constitute the stuff of being. There is being and becoming, oneness and plurality, all forming the rich and complex totality of the real. Reality includes

and exceeds the categories of change and diversity on the one hand and those of Eternity and integrality on the other. Equally so is the case in regard to the conventional dichotomy of matter and spirit. There is no affirmation of either matter or spirit to the exclusion of the other. Both are ontologically ultimate. The two do not constitute two non-communicating realms of being as in some systems, with the insoluble riddles of absolute dualism. There is inter-action through the semi-material and semi-spiritual operations of the force of Karma. Nor is this commingling of matter and spirit an indissoluble linkage. In the Spirit's march to perfection emancipation from matter is envisaged as an achievable and desirable possibility. There is the mundane life of vyavahara and also the transcendent life of paramartha. There is no laboured rationalization of untenable extremes.

If Jaina metaphysics excludes anything, it excludes the postulate of God conceived as the Creator of the world and the Saviour of individual souls. It is to be noted that in this, the system runs counter to the sentiments of popular religion and the prevailing Theistic temper of Spiritual movements. Whatever the basic spirit of accommodation, Jainism has maintained a firm stand against Theism. A clear understanding of the philosophical motive behind the attitude is necessary That the world is not explicable in terms of its immanent laws and also those furnished by the operation of Karma is a presupposition of the Creator-hypothesis. God is the 'ultimate irrationality' for explaining the Cosmos, in case the latter is not self-explanatory. But Jainism holds in consonance with the scientific philosophy of nature that it is intrinsically intelligible and needs no supernaturalistic explanation Nor does the 'saving of souls' require the grace of a transcendent being, for each soul contains in itself the possibilities of the highest life. If its abuse of its opportunities has brought about its shrinkage of powers, nothing other than the free and rightful utilization of its inherent resources can bring about its legitimate expansion. 'This is the moral of the Law of Karma It accords well with the contemporary Existentialist assertion of human freedom to the point of abandoning the dogma of God as incompatible with man's self-determination. Ultimately, therefore, the anti-theistic stand of Jainism springs from its Scientific Concept of nature and

Existentialist affirmation of freedom. A further understanding of the mechanics of nature and the potentialities of man renders the concept of an extracosmic God a superfluity, apart from its own in many intrinsic difficulties. It is the same argument in a slightly modified form that prompts the Jaina rejection of an absolutism like that of Sankara. The absolutist has to deny the rationality of Nature much more that the theist and reduce it to a mere appearance. He has to belittle human individuality much more to make way for his absolute Spirit. Affirmation of nature as real and of the ineradicable significance of individual personality renders his position much more unacceptable to the inclusive and affirmative standpoint of Jainism While the theistic and absolutistic creeds are rejected by Jainism sacrificing all the popular sentiments in their favour, it endeavours to preserve and foster to greater heights the values they stand for If Divinity represents a concrete actualization of the ultimate ideals of perfection, Jainism holds that each soul is such a divinity in the making and the shaping of itself into that perfection lies entirely within its own self-liberating powers. God as a super-natural being or the absolute as the non-dual Universal Spirit is not there. But each Spirit, such as we are, can be raised to utmost divinity and absoluteness in terms of infinite power, infinite knowledge, infinite intuition and infinite joy Something analogous to this conception is there in the outlook of Samuel Butler and S. Alexander in modern philosophy. It can be elaborated into a magnificent version of Humanism, certainly larger and profounder than that of Auguste Comte. This valuational incorporation of Theism and Absolutism within itself is yet another illustration of the logic of Comprehension characteristic of Jainism.

III

Jainism has a distinct conception of man's ultimate goal. That mundane felicity is not that goal needs no proof That it is not extinction of the positive essence of self-hood is also clear. In fact it is not conceived in negative terms at all. In reality moksha or freedom for Jainism lies in the unimpeded expression of the innate nature of the soul It is self-realization in the truest sense of the term The abundance of nature constitutive of the self is curtailed and stands virtually negated in mundane life. This has to

be liberated into its natural proportions through the removal of hindrances by way of Karma. Liberation, therefore, is the recovery of authentic individuality. This ideal is also not looked upon as the individual self attaining union with God or absorption into the Absolute. There is no God or the Absolute, other than the intrinsic destiny of each soul. Each soul is Infinite, Ananta, in power, Virya, Knowledge, Jnana, intuition, Darsana and Joy, sukha.

Avoiding details, it may be recognized that the fundamental pathway to the Supreme ideal is Right conduct, Right intuitive faith and Right knowledge. The synthetic spirit of this programme is obvious, is philosophy, mysticism and morality are assimilated into it. The process of achievement is to be initiated and executed by the individual himself. There is no theological supplementation of human effort. This is spiritualization of life through a progressive dematerialization. So much is clear and it follows smoothly from the general metaphysical framework.

There is something special in the concept of Right conduct. It is formulated into an arduous and thoroughgoing way of life. In particular, there is great emphasis on austerity, Tapas and non-violence, Ahimsa. Perhaps no other religion of the world takes these twin virtues to such seemingly impracticable extremes. May be, the modern temper witnessing the ghastly devastations engineered by man's violence and hatred, will readily welcome the ethics of non-violence and compassion. Thanks to Albert Sweitzer, a mahatma of our times, we are coming to recognize 'Reverence for Life' as the Supreme principle of Ethics. But this noble ideal becomes frothy sentiment unless it is founded on the principle of austerity, the Law of self-denial on the physical plane. A hedonistic ethics cannot generate 'creative altruism'. The hard way of ascetic self-effacement is the indispensable bed-rock for the universality of spirit, all the ancient masters had recognized this logic. We must lose our life in order to gain the higher life. In the fight against the lower self the sage Vardhamana, was an incomparable hero. Hence the devout tradition calls him the 'great hero' 'Mahâvîra'. May we cherish his great name, his great image, so that our little lives may progress somewhat in righteousness !

4

MAHÂVÎRA'S CONTRIBUTION*

—T. V. Mehta

Unlike Buddha, Mahâvîra was not the founder of Jainism but only an ardent follower of pre-vedic Sramana tradition. Its penultimate prophet was Parsvanatha, the 23rd Tirthankara of Jainas. Parsvanatha's tradition was known as Caturyama, i.e., a tradition of four-fold vows. These four-fold vows were Non-violence (Ahimsa), Truth (Satya), Non-stealing (Asteya) and Non-possession (Aparigraha). Thus the Parsva tradition did not give a separate and distinct place to Brahmacarya (Celibacy) in his scheme of four-fold vows Because it was thought that one can not enjoy sex-life without having possession of one's spouse and so if one observes non- possession he observes celibacy Secondly at that time women was considered as a property and so the vow of non-possession includes the vow of celibacy The etymological meaning of the word 'Parigraha' is 'acceptance, and there are instances in the Samskrta literature to show that the word 'Parigraha, is used for a wife, e g , the great poet Kalidasa[1] has used this word in his famous epic Raghuvamsa as under

"Ka tvam Subhe ! Kasya parigraho va" ? means 'Oh good lady, who are you ? Whose wife are you' ?

So in Parsva tradition, the principle of 'Aparigraha' or non-possession also includes celibacy and hence Brahmacarya was not given a separate and distinct place in the code of conduct. But laxity in sex life and extra-marital relation-ship could not be controlled by this bare principle of 'Aparigraha'.

Obviously this would not have also worked with saintly order of monks. Hence, Mahâvîra had to introduce the concept of Brahmacarya, as a distinct code of conduct to be followed by

* The Path of arhat A religions Democracy pp. 162 to 166

1 ''का त्वम् शुभे! कस्य परिग्रहो वा?''

monks as well as the house-holders called 'Sravakas'. For house-holders, however, this concept of strict celibacy was modified and what was prescribed was not only a strict monogamy, but also a restrained sexual life.

It appears that after 23rd Tirthankara Parsva, Mahâvîra systematically organised the Jaina society into four distinct classes of Sramanas (male monks), Sramanis (female monks or nuns), Sravakas (male house-holders) and Sravikas (female house-holders). Unlike Buddha, he did not hesitate to give a distinct place to females in the saintly order. He, however, laid down a very strict code of conduct for male and female monks and Brahmacarya occupied a prominent place in his scheme of code. It is considered a must for spiritual practices as well as for physical fitness. Relaxations are contemplated in favour of house-holders for obvious reasons.

(5) *Aparigraha* (Restrictions in possession)—Those who try to possess, are, in fact, themselves possessed We do become slaves of our possessions. But we like that slavery because we are accustomed to it. However, we forget that all objects of the world are constantly changing. They are changing in form and in qualities and they are also changing hands, their possessors. This is the reality of life. So the idea of possession is in fact illusory. But we like to remain in illusion and that is why when our possessions change hands, we become sad. We desire not only to regain the lost possessions, but also to gain control over alternative things of the world. This process, i.e., the process of living in illusions goes on constantly and causes grief and tormentations. The most noticeable fact about those ignorant people, obsessed with greed for possession, whether of material things or of some cherished ideas and ideologies, is their desire that the things and ideas which they possess shall remain as they are. This is the most unreal delusion—the root cause of all unhappiness. If one hankers after worldly things, it is a sure succession of uncontrolled desires. Uncontrolled desires have no end. German philosopher Schopenhauer has rightly pointed out that for every wish that is satisfied there remain ten that denied, that desire is infinite and the fulfilment is limited and that so long as we are given to the throngs of desires with their constant hopes and fears we can never have true and lasting happiness and peace. Lord Buddha,

therefore, rightly emphasized the necessity to curtail our desires. The principle of Aparigraha teaches us to restrict our possessions to the minimum. This can be done only if we discipline our wants. Even earning more than what is necessary offends the principle of Aparigraha. Good Jainas take a vow to fix their possession of material things including wealth.

Economy of Indian society was, till recently, dominated by this principle of Aparigraha. However, the more we have come under the influence of Western materialism, more superficial our attitude towards the life has become. Past history of India is replete with examples to show that a multi-millionaire would himself lead the life of a poor man and would be prepared to donate the whole of his wealth for a public cause. There was no marked difference between the life style and standard of the persons belonging to different financial stratas of the society A rich man did not desire more luxury simply because he could afford to spend. Now the standards have changed, outlook towards life and life-style is also changed Earn more and spend more; increase you standard of living, simple thinking and higher living-a contrast to what English poet Wordsworth said—are the mottoes of modern life. The result is licentiousness, absence of moral discipline, unnecessary and unfruitful spending, want of equilibrium in the prices of consumer goods, diversion of essential raw materials for the production of luxury goods, exploitation of labour and consumers, unequal distribution of wealth produced by the society and the resultant unrest and class war

The principle of 'Aparigraha' was never more relevant than today. It is highly unfortunate that even the socialist ideology led by thinkers like Marx and others, who revolted against social injustices, resulting from economic imbalances, failed to go to the root of the problem, and could not go beyond the materialistic conceptions of history and economics. They forgot to take into account that a human being is the unit of the society and hence no social structure can be effectively improved without improving its units.

Indian seers have always kept this aspect in mind. They have always emphasized the advancement of the individual character of each man because they knew that a society can

progress only to the extent to which its individual components improve. What they taught by 'Aparigraha' was not a mere religion; it was sociology in its truest sense. To create class conflict and then to fight the said class conflict was, to them an absurd process. They divised a method which would prevent the generation of any conflict in the society.

Today the world economy is in shamble. So called communist economy, as practiced in Soviet Russia and other East-European countries, has proved to be a disaster. Economy of developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America is on the brink of disaster. North America which feels proud of its Capitalist System is under a great strain and its people are not capable of tolerating even the slightest jolt to their comforts. Citizens there begin their careers as house-holders by incurring debts which in many cases do not end till life time, and this is because they find it impossible to live without modern gadgets and cannot control their increasing desires. One catastrophy like a world war is sufficient to shatter their proud citadel of capitalist concomitance.

The root cause of all this, as pointed out by Indian seers, is uncontrolled appetite to possess and to enjoy more and more material objects of life. Want of inherent restraint from within, want of realization of life's realities, want of the knowledge that real enjoyment of life is not in material pursuits, are responsible for our present unrest and sense of insecurity. The problem can never be solved by mere economic reforms. All economic theories have to be worked out amongst the human beings, who are in need of psychological, emotional and sentimental treatment. Economists and political theorists are great ignoramuses in such treatment.

The solution of 'Aparigraha' was perhaps not known to Marx and even if it was known to him he would have, in all probability laughed and scoffed at it. One should, however, not be surprised if Marx would change his ideas and agree with the Indian seers if he is given a chance to get up from his grave today—much before the day of Kayamata and see the results of his pure dialectical materialism.

Among the modern political leaders of the world, Mahatma

Gandhi may be credited to have practiced whatever he preached to others

He himself had no 'Parigraha' and taught the Indians as well as the whole world that limitation of desires and restraint of possessions, simple living and high thinking, are the only realistic way to live a happy, contended and peaceful life—a life without conflicts and constraints. But ironically and unfortunately his teachings were not given even a polite and courteous nod of affirmation by his own followers during his own life time and the economy of India—the land where the lessons of 'Aparigraha' have been taught through thousands of years—has willingly slided and slipped to western economy and materialistic pursuits

'Aparigraha' is more relevant today than it was in the times of Mahâvîra two thousand and five hundred years ago

We shall next consider the *modus operandi* to implement this Pancasila

5

FIFTH VOW OF VARDHĀMANA MAHÂVÎRA : ITS CAUSES

—Ram Chandra Jain

"The first (those under first Tirthankaras) Saints were simple but slow of understanding, the last saints prevaricating and slow of understanding, those between the two simple and wise, hence there are two forms of laws."[1]

Thus said Gautama to Kesi on his question, "The Law taught by the great sage Parsva, recognises but four vows, whilst that of Vardhamana enjoins five Both laws pursuing the same end, what has caused this difference ?"[2]

Gautama's answer may be a complete truth but this does not satisfy the modern scientific scholar. Scholars have accepted that Parsava was a great historical personage and Mahâvîra came 250 years after him There must have been great socio-historical forces at work during this period that brought this revolutionary change converting the nature of simple and wise people into prevaricating and slow

Aryo-Brahms had finally subjugated the western parts of Bharata after their victory in Dasrajna war Circa 1150 B. C. They had settled in the region of Saraswati and Drsadvati valleys which they renamed Brahmavarta. Eminent scholars maintain that the Aryo-Brahms, who later came to be known as Vedic people, were associated with great acts of violence in war and in peace which the original people of Bharata strenously opposed. The violence aspect of Vedic culture is rightly given prominence but its another aspect, the aspect of sex-relationship, has not even been given due recongnition.

We find three strata of sex-relationship of the Vedic people in Rigveda and later Vedic literature. Firstly, unlicensed

communal sex-relationship between man and woman during their nomadic semi-barbarous state continuing up to 1150 B.C., secondly unlicensed free sex-relationship after they adopted the settled patriarchal family state till Circa 750 B.C., and thirdly sex-freedom under regulated family State till Circa 600 B.C.

When the Aryans and their successors, the Aryo-Europeans, the Aryo-Asians, the Aryo-Hittites, the Aryo-Iranians and the Aryo-Brahms, were in the nomadic state; they developed the patriarchal system as the son was of greater importance to daughter for winning wars and subjugating adversaries The Aryan people from the very beginning had prejudices against the womanhood The best utility of the woman was to produce children[3] and specially sons to strengthen their physical might. Vedic people always cherished the birth of a son and that was a great occasion for joy and festivity They deprecated the birth of a daughter[4]

The Aryans in their earlier stages were organised in tribal collectives. They had a collective system of production which they called Yajna. Idea of relationship like father, mother, son, daughter etc. was absent and men and women had free sexual intercourse with one another in the presence of all They took part in mass sexual intercourse in the presence of fire, invigorated by the quaffing of plenty of Soma juice or liquor.[5] Yajna seems to have meant in these remote times an orgy of promiscuous sexual intercourse by the side of the alter itself Yajna means procreation, without any relationship of father and mother, in context of social sex-relationship

They usually organised popular festivities called Samana. Yaska explains it as an epithet of Yosa (योषा) in the sense of 'Unanimous.[6] He gives योषा the meaning of a young woman tracing it to you 'to mix' literally "mixing with a male" [7] The sense here clearly is that all males and females met there together with one mind, with unanimity There was no distinction of father and daughter, mother and son, brother and sister but there was only one distinction of man and woman but both having unanimity of plan and purpose. But Yaska appears to be wrong in taking the principal word as 'Samana' This may as well be 'Samana'. This fits in well with the historical context. It may be that during the 7th

centuries B.C. when Yaska flourished, people might have begun to deride the primitive Samana institution which might have forced him to play intellectualism with grammar. 'Samana' is a proper noun, not an epithit of योषा signifying 'Communal Festival' where all partaking members of the community were of one mind. Young and old women rushed forth to Samana with joy and felicity to find lovers and to enjoy with their old lovers.[8]

This state of sexual-relationship is very correctly reflected in the two epithits signifying this state of affairs. This relationship is summed up in the words Jara[9] and Jaya[10]. Jara means a male human being who is the lover of any woman in the society. This word does not carry the sinister meaning of a voluptuous unsocial element in this age. The sinister meaning was later on attached to this word. Jaya was not used in the sense of Patni or married wife. Any woman of society who bore children from her lover the Jara was called Jaya This clearly establishes that men and women, without any distinction, could make merriment with each other with mutual consent without social disapproval or blasphemy. Love bears throughout the stamp of an undisguised natural sensuality.[11]

Women in this communal context, were known as Yosas (योषा) More beautiful damsels amongst them were known as Usas. Usa in Rigveda is depicted as brilliant and attractive maiden dressed in variegated colours, ever joyful dancing with her breasts open, effulent in pearless beauty, radiant with her lover, charming and resplendant[12] They did not belong to the Hetaera class of society as suggested by Pischel and Geldner[13] but that was the general state of the social organisation. What came to be looked down in later times on the division of society into the Noble and the Hated was approbated and revered in the undivided state of society Urvasis were best among Usas. They could not bind themselves to any one particular man. They belonged to the whole society or Gana. Urvasi, the Ganike was the mother of the illustrious Sage Vasistha[14] but his fatherhood is ambiguous and doubtful. Urvasis were also used to ensnare the effective enemy leaders as in the case of Non-Aryan Pururava. Sex-relationship of the Vedic people, in their earliest stage, was of the type of unrestrained and free communal sex enjoyment.

Aryo-Brahms after their conclusive victory in Dasrajna War had settled in the Saraswati-Drasadvati region. They had earlier come in contact with a similar culture in rain two centuries ago; but in the nomadic state, they did not assimilate much of that culture. The impact of the original Bharatiya culture was very effective on them after they took to settled life. Families on the patriarchal pattern were established. Aryo-Brahms or the Vedic people were in possession of a vast domain of land, prosperous in agriculture and industry with a very high state of culture and civilization The wholesale massacre of the original people of Bharat on battle fields left numerous widows as prizes of war whom they took as their slaves and concubines. Indra led the process. He took to concubinage the widow of Puru Purukutsa, the leader of the Ten-Republics confederacy, Purukut sani Narmada who afterwards gave birth to a levirate son Trasadasyu from Indra.[15]

The Vedic people were great intellectuals. They readily understood that their old tribal collective way of life and socio-economic institution of Yajna could not endure in their original form in the altered circumstances. Their first reaction to the influence of the spiritual Bharatiya culture was that they disintegrated their tribal life and took to family life Communal production and procreation had also to be given up but they did not give up their basic concept of collectivity Kingship was created and all families were made subject to it Yajna was the highest and best duty of the King and hence socio-economic life of the people was subordinated to the institution of Yajna. Thus the direct social, economic and public life became ritualised.

The conquerers changed their institutions to suit the changed circumstances but the state of their sex-relationship continued to be the same, rather in an aggravated form. The existence of the widows of Aryo-Brahms adversaries accelerated the process. With the establishment of the institution of family, the institution of Marriage was also evolved But the old tradition of communal sex-relationship could not die in one day Polygamy[16] and Polyandry existed side by side Women, widows or having their husbands living, bore levirate children as Trasadaysu and Upamasravas by Niyoga custom.[17] Unmarried maidens bore

children[18] and had paramours. Unmarried girls were immoral[19] and married women went astray.[20] The maidens and the married women had their lovers but they were not looked askance by society.[21]

Incestuous intercourse between father and daughter has been recorded in Rigveda (10.61.5-7) but that appears to be the memory of a faded ancient social event. But sexual intercourse between brother and sister[22] has not yet died out though it was in the state of fast decadence as is evidenced by Yama-Yami dialogue (Rigveda 1010).

Though the practice of promiscuous mass sexual intercourse in public was discontinued; its memory was still cherished in this period After the slaying of Horse in Asvamedha, the chief queen had to lie down with the dead horse in a state of sexual intercourse. She was accompanied by three other queens and four hundred attendants including maidens (कुमारी), women discarded by their husbands (परित्यक्ता) and oversexed amazon type of women (वागता)[23] There may or may not have been mass sexual intercourse with them but at the least, this clearly establishes that the ancient practice was ritualised and still remembered with joy and felicity.

Women were fast losing their independence They were reduced to the status of chattel and were owned and disposed of by man like chattel. They could be given away as sacrificial fees to the priests alongwith gold and cattle. Abhyarartin and Vasistha got two damsels each in Dana or gift.[24] Risi Sobhari got 500 Vadhus in gift[25] Word 'Vadhu' (वधू) has a significant pointer in this context. Vadhus are those women who are carried away by force or with consent and made wives or concubines Vadhu in the sense of a married wife is a post-Mahâvîra growth Anga gave 10,000 female-slaves to his preist Aitareya.[26] Rsi Aruni[27] possessed Dasis. Aswins presented fair-skinned women to black Kanva.[28] Risis and others guests could get the daughter and the wife of the host for their temporary sexual use.[29] Women were getting to be the victims of the best of the men in power, the kings, the priests and their henchmen. The moral decadence had set in and women were degraded to a worse position than they enjoyed

in the early primitive state of communal life. We find great confusion in sex-relationship in the age.

Rigveda was redacted Circa 1000 B.C. This age culminated in the redaction of later Samhitas, Tenth Mandal of Rigveda and Brahmanas. This happened Circa 750 B.C. The new culture had been established by violence and it was through violence that it solidified its power. Ritualisation of sacrifices symbolised the highest stage of violence. This violence brought in human degradation preparing field for the slavery of womanhood. Parsva came on the historical scene in this age in the foot-steps of Munis and Sisnadevas of the pre-Rigvedic and Rigvedic fame.[30] He mainly directed all his spiritual energies against the forces of violence. He gave to humanity the call for the re-establishment of the order of non-violence. He was very much successful in reducing the quantity of violence in Vedic way of life. Vedic society reacted to this non-violent onslaught by adopting a further change in their way of life They created three-fold Ashrama System; i.e. Brahmacharya, Grihastha and Vanaprastha. Sanyasa was added later on after the Mahâvîra age, This regulated family state is the lest but the most important period of sex-relationship Circa 750-600 B C

Word Ahimsa or non-violence is not found in Samhitas, Brahmanas and Aranyakas. It is found only twice and only in one pre-Mahâvîra Upanisad, the Chhandojya Upanisad. They indicate that Vedic Risis had begun to appreciate Ahimsa. Vedic violence in sacrifices had become limited in scope and they began to be confined to specially ordained places and occasions.[31] Inhuman and ghastly violence to life had retraced back many of its steps.[32]

But the forces of fast decaying sex-relationship could not be kept in check Parsva had preached Chujjama Dhama which did not specifically mention a vow regarding sex-relationship It was included in the fourth vow of Aparigraha; the connotation of the epithet Aparigaha being 'Attachment' (मुच्छा परिग्गहो)[33] which includes attachment to property and sex both. But after the death of Parsva no outstanding personality of great eminence arose to fight against the evil of moral decadance. Yajnavalkya reflected

the popular state of affairs in saying that no one cares whether a wife is unchaste or not.[34]

A doubt may be raised that when there was so much moral decadence in the age of Parsva; why did he not fight this evil and give a specific vow of Brahmacharya ? His age was marked by the general prevalence of sacrifices in their fullest glory. Brahmavarta witnessed the scenes of great and numerous Asvamedhas. Vedic people were perpetuating great violence to human beings and beasts in the name of culture. Yajna was their chief weapon. The whole atmosphere was surcharged with violence. The period was marked by mass animal sacrifices on large scale Degeneration in sex-relationship was only a necessary corollary of the violent Yajnas. It was only a branch of a big tree. Parsva attacked the principal evil. He might have thought that the branch will fall with the fall of the tree as Mahatma Gandhi thought that the Princely State would fall with the fall of British India Empire. He was so successful in uprooting the violent Yajnas that they became a memory of the past and the priests of Brhadaranyaka Upanisad bemoaned the fading away of Asvamedhas performed by the Pariksitas of old.[35] It was befitting of a supreme leader that he did not fight on more than one front and channelised all his energies to principal and main front. It paved the way for Mahâvîra's success against this sex evil.

The old order of sex-relationship in practical and ritualised form continued as before Vedic people had consolidated their power through Tri-Ashrama system. The institution of Brahmacharya evolved and glorified It ordained a young boy to live with his master for a certain number of years and learn proficiency in the Art of priesthood Brahmachari was a pupil, a religious student or student of sacred wisdom.[36] It is not without significance that the word Brahmacharya is not used in the kernel of Rigveda. The Vedic tribal collective was undivided in the earlier stages and there were neither Varnas nor Ashramas. It was only Brahma or Brahma or the tribal collective and everybody acted according to the injunctions of that Brahma. But when Brahma got disreputed, a class had to be created to safeguard the interests of priesthood and hence we find students for Vedic studies, the art of priesthood.

The discipline of Brahmachari[37] does not include any rule regarding sex-relationship. But one curious rule is included there and it is this—"If a Brahmachari does not look at a naked woman, he obtains the beauty that is in medium.". This is a rule purely for materialistic benefit. The beauty of a woman may help the Brahmachari in his further years to enjoy more and more carnal pleasures, otherwise the beauty of a maiden is not needed. This is no injunction against sexual intercourse. We find lapses of pupils with the wives of their masters and the sin was considered so trivial that it could be expiated by the recitation of a few mantras.[38] A sacrificial ritual presided over by such a priest required a pair to be united within the sacrificial ground.[39] It appears quite certain that strict celebacy was not a part of discipline of a Brahmachari

When Vardhaman Mahâvîra appeared on the historical scene, he found sex-relationship completely shattered. What was more intolerable to him was the state of complete degeneration in the whole of Northern India brought by a foreign ideology of violence and exploitation Woman who is equal partner of man was being exploited for the lust of man She had been reduced to the status of slavery to this extent that she was also taken prisoner in war and publically auctioned like a Chattel. The case of Chandanabala is in point She along with her mother was taken prisoner after her father Dadhivahana, King of Champa, was killed in battle The conquerer Satanika, king of Vatsas wanted to rape the chastity of her mother who instantaneously committed suicide on the spot. Chandanabala was publicly auctioned.[40] After this event Mahâvîra attained purest knowledge.[41] His first sermon also included the fifth vow of Brahmacharya along with fourfold vows of Parsva, i e Non-Violence, Truth, Non-stealing and non-Attachment or Aparigraha. It was this historical and social setting that led Mahâvîra to specifically enunciate the vow of Brahmacharya to be followed by Chaturvidhasangha. Hermann Jacobi maintains that men of upright disposition and of quick understanding would not go astray by observing the four vows literally i.e by not abstaining from sexual intercourse. There was decay of the morals of the monastic order.[42] Jacobi did not sufficiently pay heed to the consequences of the vows of

non-violence and non-attachment. A monk strictly observing these two vows could not indulge in an act of violence and attachment which necessarily accompany the act of sexual intercourse. His argument is mechanistic and unreal. The influence of Vedic sex atmosphere had very likely brought in laxity in some saints and lay followers of Parsva and this state also as a part of historical background might have influenced the judgement of Mahâvîra. If the laxity, as suggested by Jacobi, would have been the sole consideration, Mahâvîra could have set it right by rules of internal discipline alone. But it was the general social atmosphere of moral decadence that influenced the judgement of Mahâvîra to independently propound the vow of Brahmacharya

Brahmacharya, according to Vardhaman was not the study of Vedic or any other literature or the art of priesthood It was a conduct of life. Brahmacharya is victory over attachment It is complete abstinence from sexual intercourse. Nay, it is much more It is complete control over Matter.[43]

References

1 Sacred Books of the East, Volume 45, 1895, Uttardhayana Sutra, 23-26 Page 122

2 Op Cit, Utt Su 23-24 Page 122

3 (1) Rigveda 1 91 20, 1 92 13,3 1 23, 10 42 45, 10 85 25.
(2) Atharvaveda 3 32 2, 5 35 11

4 Atharvaveda 6 11 3

5 PD Karmakar, The Asvamedha, Its original signification, A B O R I vol 30 Page 341 343

6 Siddheswar Varma, Etymologies of Yaska, 1953, Page 66

7 Op Cit, Page 82

8 (1) Rigveda 2 36 1, 4 58 8, 6 75 4, 7 2 5
(2) Atharvaveda 2 36 1

9 Rigveda 1 66 8, 1 117 18, 1 134 3, 1 152 4, 9 32 5

10 (1) Rigveda 1 105 2,1 124 7, 3 53 4, 4 3 2, 4.18 3, 9 82 4, 10 10 7, 10 17 1, 10 71 4
(2) Atharvaveda 8 76 3-5, 19 42 2,3 30 2, 6 60 1

11 A Weber, The History of Indian Literature, 1261, Page 38

12 Rigveda 1 11 10, 2 29 1 1 92 4

13 VM Apte, Vedic Age, 1957, Page 391

14 (1) Rigveda 7 33 11
(2) S R Shastri, Women in the Vedic Age, 1954, Page 63

15 Rigveda 4 42 8-9

16. Rigveda 1 62 11, 1 71 1, 1 104 3, 105 8, 1 112 19, 1 186.7, 6.53 4, 7 18 2, 7 26 3, 10 43 1, 10 101 11
17 Rigveda 1 167 4 to 6, 8 29 8, 10.85 37-38
18 (1) Rigveda 10 40 2, 4 42.8-9, 10 33 6-7
(2) Atharvaveda 10 18 8
(3) R C Jain, Origin of Kuru Tribe, read before History Section of the Oriental Conference
19 (1) Rigveda 2 15 5,
(2) Atharvaveda 8 6.13
20 Rigveda 1 124 7, 4 5 5, 8 35 3
21 Rigveda 1 134 3, 9 32 5
22 Rigveda 8 91 4, 2 29 1, 8 17 7,
23 Atharvaveda 8 6 7
24 R D Karamakar, op-Cit Page 342
25 Rigveda 6 27 7, 7 18 22-23
26 Rigveda 8 19 36
27 Aitereya Brahmana 8 22
28 Brhadoranyaka Upanisad 6 2 7,
29 Rigveda 1 116 23, 1 117 7-8, 8 85 3-4, 8 50 10
30 J J Meyer, Sexual life in Ancient India, 1952, page 512 (507 to 518)
31 Chhandogya Upanisad 3 17 4, 8 15 1
32 Dasvaikalika Sutra 6 21
33 Satapatha Brahmana 1 3 1,21
34 Brhadaranyaka Upanisad 3.3 1-2
35 (1) Rigveda 10 109 2 to 5
(2) Atharvaveda 6 108 2, 19 19 8, 6 133 3, 5 10 3 to 8 and 12 to 17, 5 19 7 and 12 to 15
(3) Taittiriya Samhita 3 1 9 4, 6 3 10 5
(4) Chhandogy Upanisad 4 4 1 and 3, 4 10 1, 8 5 1 and 3,8 7 3, 8 11 3
(5) Brhadaranyaka Upanisad 5 2 1, 6 2 4
36 (1) Anharvaveda 11 5
(2) Taithiriya Samhita 6 3 10 5
(3) Satpath Brahmana 11 3 3 1
(4) Gopatha Brahmana 1 2 1 to 9
37 M Bloomfield, Op Cit, Page 111
38 (1) Chhavdojya upanisad 5 10 9
(2) Macdonell and Keith Vedic Index, 1958, volume 2 page 76
39 Taithinya Samhita 7 5 9 2
40 Kalpa Sutra, Sutra 96
41 H C Roy Chowdhery, Political History of Ancient India, 1950, Page 109
6 Sacred Books of the East, volume 45, Page 122 FN3
1 (1) Uttaradhayans Sutra 32 12, 16 10
(2) Dasavaikalika Sutra 8 59 8 60

6

DATE OF MAHÂVÎRA'S NIRVÂNA*

—Hiralal Jain

The last of the Twenty-four Jaina Tirthankaras or prophets was Mahâvîra Vardhamana who was a contemporary of Gautama Buddha the founder of Buddhism. The date of Mahâvîra's Nirvana, therefore, is very important for the chronology of ancient Indian History in general and of Jainism in particular. But, unfortunately, the date has not been so far fixed with accuracy, one of the reasons being that the old mentions of the date in Jaina literary traditions seem to be considerably at variance with one another. The purpose of this paper is briefly to draw attention to those mentions and to see if any explanation of their discrepancies is possible.

Amongst the Jainas there is current an era called Vira Nirvana Samvat It is believed to have started from the day of the Nirvana of Mahâvîra which took place on the fourteenth day of the dark fortnight of the month Kartika. The year 2466 of this era was completed on the 29th October 1940 A.D., and from the 30th October 1940 the Nirvana year 2467 has begun. According to this, the Nirvana, of Mahâvîra took place 2467-1940 = 527 years before Christ, and 2467-1997 = 470 years before the beginning of the current Vikrama era.

Now the question is, when did Vikrama era begin ? The Digambara *Nandi Samgha pattavali* says :

सत्तरि-चउसद-युतो जिणकाला विक्कमो (-मरस) हवइ जम्मो।'

"Four hundred and seventy years after the Nirvana of Mahâvîra was Vikrama born." According to this view the Vikrama era began with the birth of Vikrama which event took place 470 years after the Nirvana of Mahâvîra .

* Nagpur University Journal, No 6, December 1940

But a number of other mentions make the Vikrama era begin, not from the birth of Vikrama, but from his coronation. For example, in the *Sthaviravali* of Merutunga (13th-14th century) we find :

विक्कमरज्जारंभा पुरओ सिरि-वीर-णिव्वुई भणिया।

सुन्न-मुणि वेयजुत्तो विक्कमकालाउ जिणकालो।।

"The Nirvana of Vira (Mahâvîra) is said to have taken place prior to the reign of Vikrama, and the difference between the Nirvana era and the Vikrama era is 470 years " Similarly, we find in the *Tapagaccha Pattavali* (16th century).

तद्राज्यं तु श्रीवीरात् सप्ततिवर्षशतचतुष्टये ४७० संजातम्।

"His (Vikrama's) reign began 470 years after Vira (Nirvana)." In the *Pavapurikalpa of Jinaprabha* Suri (13th-14th Century) we are told in the form of a prophecy made by the prophet himself

महमुक्खगमणाओ पालय-णंद-चंद्गुत्ताइराईसु वोलीणेसु चउसय-सत्तरेहिं वासेहिं विक्कमाइच्चो राया होही।

"After my attainment of salvation when Palaka, Nanda, Candragupta and other kings would pass away, 470 years having elapsed, Vikramaditya would become king." Yet another work *Prabhavakacarita* by Prabhacandra Suri (13th century) says ·

इत: श्रीविक्रमादित्य: शास्त्यवन्तीं नराधिप:।

अनृणां पृथिवीं कुर्वन् प्रवर्तयति वत्सरम्।।

"Henceforth king Vikramaditya would rule at Avanti, and freeing the earth of its debt, would start an era."

These mentions clearly lay down that the Vikrama era began from the coronation of Vikrama and not from his birth, and since Vikrama is said to have ascended the throne at the age of 18 years, Mr K.P Jayaswal proposed that the Nirvana of Mahâvîra should be understood to have taken place 470+18 = 488 years prior to the Vikrama era [2]

Yet another view had arisen out of the mention by Hemacandra in his Parisista Parva (12th century) as follows ·

एवं च श्रीमहावीरमुक्तर्वर्षशते गते।

पंच-पंचाशदधिके चन्द्रगुप्तोऽभवन्नृप:।। (परि० ८, ३३९)

"Thus, after the lapse of 155 years after the salvation of

Mahâvîra , Candragupta became king." Now, the period between Candragupta's coronation and Vikrama's coming to the throne is found to be 255 years, and therefore it was calculated that the real date of Vira Nirvana is 255 + 155 = 410 years before Vikrama This view was propounded by western scholars like Jacobi and Charpentier.

As against all these mentions there is quite a large number of references in Digambara Jaina works, older than the former, to the effect that the Vikrama era originated from the death of king Vikrama. In the *Darsanasara* of Devasena (10th Century), for example, we find the following verses :

छत्तीसे वरिससए विक्कमरायस्य मरणपत्तस्स।
सोरट्ठे बलहीए उप्पणो सेवडो संघो।। ११।।
पंचसरा छव्वीसे विक्कमरायस्य मरणपत्तस्स।
दक्खिणमहुराजादो दाविडसंघो महामीहो।। २८।।
× × × × × × × ×
सत्तसए तेवण्णे विक्कम्स्यस्य मरणपत्तस्स।
णंदियडे वरगामे कट्ठो संघो मुणेयव्वो।। ३८।।

In these verses we find mention of dates in terms of the Vikrama era for important events in the history of Jainism In the first verse we are told that the Svetambara sect originated in Saurastra at Valabhi 136 years after the death of Vikrama. In the second verse the Dravida Samgha is said to have originated at Southern Mathura (Madura) 526 years after the death of Vikrama, and the third verse records the origin of Kastha Samgha at Nanditata village 753 years after the death of king Vikrama. Similarly, Vamadeva in his *Bhavasamgraha* records the time of the origin of the Svetambara sect as follows :

सषट्त्रिंशे शतेऽब्दानांमृते विक्रमराजनि।
सौराष्ट्रे वल्लभीपुर्यामभूत्तत्कथ्यते मया।।

"136 years after the death of Vikrama, what happened in Saurastra at Valabhi, that I declare here." Amitagati also in his *Subhasita-ratna-sandoha* records the time of the completion of his book in the following words :

समारूढे पूतत्रिदशवसतिं विक्रमनृपे।
सहस्रे वर्षाणां प्रभवति हि पंचाशदधिके।
समाप्तं पंचम्यामवति धरिणीं मुंजनृपतौ।
सिते पक्षे पौषे बुधहितमिदं शास्त्रमनघम्।।

"When King Vikrama had ascended the holy heavens 1050 years, then on the 5th day of the bright fortnight of the month of Pausa did I complete this faultless sacred book for the benefit of the wise, when king Munja was safeguarding the earth." Ratnanandi also, in his *Bhadrabahu-carita*, records a date as follows :

मृते विक्रमभूपाले सप्तविंशतिसंयुते।
दशपंचशतेऽब्दानामतीते श्रृणुतापरम्।।१५७।।

"When king Vikrama had died, 1527 years after that, what happened, listen."

These mentions are quite enough to show that right from the 10th to the 16th century, the Vikrama era was believed by writers to have originated from the death of Vikrama, and not from his birth or coronation. The previous two eras, namely of Mahâvîra and of Buddha, were also associated with the death of the persons commemorated by them. It may, therefore, be inferred that the period of 470 years is from the Nirvana of Mahâvîra to the death of king Vikrama Vikrama's reign, according to Merutunga's *Vicarasreni*, was sixty years (विक्रमस्य राज्यं ६० वर्षाणि). If we deduct these sixty years from the period of 470 years, we get 410 years as the period from Mahâvîra's Nirvana to Vikrama's coronation.

There now remains the question of the discrepancy in the mentions of the period that elapsed from the Nirvana of Mahâvîra to Candragupta's coronation The old traditional verses that record the details of the period are as follows[3] ·

जं रयणिं कालगओ अरिहा तित्थंकरो महावीरो।
तं रयणिं अवणिवई अहिसित्तो पालओ राया।।१।।
सट्ठी पालयरणो पणवण्णसयं तु होइ णंदाणं।
अट्ठसयं मुरियाणं तीस च्चिअ पूसमित्तस्स।।२।।
बलमित्त-भणुमित्तं सट्ठ वरिसाणि चंत्त णहवाणे।
तहं गद्दभिल्लरज्जं तेरस वरिस सगस्स चउं वरिसा।।३।।

These verses lay down the duration of reigns of kings and

dynasties in succession exactly from the day of Mahâvîra's Nirvana to Vikrama's coronation as follows :

	Years
Palaka	60
Nandas	155
Mauryas	108
Pusyamitra	30
Balamitra and Bhanumitra	60
Nahapana	40
Gardhabhilla	13
Saka	4
	470

It may be argued that these kings and dynasties may not be successive, but, in some cases, contemporary, because, for example, Palaka ruled at Ujjain while the Nandas ruled in Magadha at Pataliputra We are, however, told that Palaka had taken possession of Pataliputra as well, when Udayin died heirless ·

सिरिजिण-णिव्वाण-गमण-रयणीए उज्जेणीए चंडपज्जोअ-मरणे पालओ राया अहिसित्तो। तेण य अपुत्त-उदाइ-मरणे कोणिअ-रज्जं पाडलिपुरं पि अहिट्ठिअं।[4]

According to this order and periods of kings and dynasties the period from Mahâvîra's Nirvana to Candragupta's coronation is 60+155 = 215 years. But according to Hemacandra, as mentioned before, this period is only 155 years This discrepancy of 60 years was noticed by the ancient chronicler Merutunga who remarks in his *Vicarasreni* as follows ·

यच्च परिशिष्ट-पर्वण्युक्तम् 'एवंच श्रीमहावीर.....' तच्चिन्त्यम् यतः एवं ६० वर्षाणि त्रुट्यन्ति, अन्यग्रंथैः सह विरोधश्च।

"In *Parisista Parva* the period recorded from the Nirvana of Mahâvîra to Candragupta's coronation is 155 years But this falls short by 60 years, and thus it is in conflict with the mentions in other books." The discrepancy is, however, explainable when we take into consideration another verse of *Parisista Parva* which is as follows .

अनन्तरं वर्द्धमानस्वामि निर्वाण-वासरात्।
गतायां षष्टिवत्सरयामिष नन्दोऽभवन्नृपः (परि० ६, २४३.)

Here we are told that Nanda became king sixty years after the Nirvana of Mahâvîra . The same we find mentioned in the succession list reproduced above. It, therefore, appears that what

Hemacandra has recorded is correct, that is to say, the period from Mahâvîra's Nirvana to the beginning of the Nanda dynasty was 60 years and that from Mahâvîra's Nirvana to Candragupta's coronation was 155 years. Other writers seem to have confused this and taken these two periods successively, instead of including the period before the Nandas within 155 years. The period of the Nandas would really work out as 155 – 60 = 95 years which is almost in agreement with the Pauranic record of a hundred years for the Nandas .

उद्धरिष्यति तान् सर्वान् कौटिल्यो वै द्विजर्षभः।

भुक्त्वा महीं वर्षशतं नरेन्द्रः सं भविष्यति।। ब्रह्माण्ड पु० ३, ७४, १४३

All the Jaina traditions, thus, boil down to this that there were 155 years from Mahâvîra Nirvana to Candragupta's coronation, 155 + 108 + 30 + 60 + 40 + 13 + 4 = 410 years upto Vikrama's coronation, and 410 + 60 = 470 upto Vikrama's death, and that the Vikrama era began with the death of Vikrama

References

1 जैनसिद्धान्त भास्कर 1915, 1, 4, पृष्ठ 74
2 Bihar and Orissa R S J , 1915
3 तपागच्छ पट्टावली ; विचारश्रेणी of मेरुतुंग (with some verbal variants)
4 सिरिदुसमाकाल-समणसंघथय-अवचूरि (पट्टावलीसमुच्चय, पृ० 17),
5 जैन साहित्य संशोधक, 2, 4

7

488 B.C. AS THE DATE OF MAHÂVÎRA NIRVÂNA*

—H.C. Seth

The traditional chronology of the Svetambara sect of the Jains given in Tapagachha Pattavali and Merutunga's Vicarsreni, which has been made familiar by scholars like Buhler, Jacobi and Charpentier, puts Mahâvîra Nirvana 470 years before the Vikrama era. As the beginning of the Vikrama era synchronises with 58 B.C. these traditions will give 528 B.C. as the date of Mahâvîra Nirvana. These traditions record that Mahâvîra died on the same night as Palaka was anointed king in Avanti, and 470 years between Mahâvîra Nirvana and the commencement of the Vikrama era are made up of the reign-periods of the following kings and dynasties :

	Years
Palaka	60
Nandas	155
Mauryas	108
Pusyamitra	30
Balamitra and Bhanumitra	60
Nahavana	40
Gardabhila	13
Sakas	4
	470

After the Sakas in Merutunga's Vicarsreni we have 135 years assigned to Vikramaditya and his dynasty after which, or 605 years after Mahâvîra Nirvana comes the Saka King who displaces the dynasty of Vikramaditya.

* Proceedings of the Indian history congress, Sixth Session, 26-28 December, 1943.

Much credit has not been given to the Jain traditional date of 528 B.C. for the death of Mahâvîra. This date puts too big a gap between Buddha and Mahâvîra to make them contemporaneous, which fact is so clearly implied in both the Buddhist as well as the Jain traditions There is almost a general agreement among the modern scholars that Buddha died within a few years of 480 B.C. Elsewhere I have argued afresh for 487 B C. as the date of Buddha Nirvana[1], and even this will place a difference of nearly 40 years between the death of Buddha and Mahâvîra, if the Jain traditional date of 528 B C for Mahâvîra Nirvana is accepted.

To overcome this difficulty and in order to bring the death of the two teachers nearer to each other Charpentier following Jacobi adopts 468 B C as the date of Mahâvîra Nirvana on the authority of the Jain author Hemachandra As he argues, "The dynastic list of the Jain's mentioned above tells us that Candragupta, the Sandrokottos of the Greeks, began his reign 255 years before the Vikrama era, or in 313 B C., a date that cannot be far wrong And Hemachandra states that at this time 155 years had elapsed since the death of Mahâvîra which would thus have occurred in 468 B C.[2]

The great difficulty in accepting 468 B C as the date for Mahâvîra Nirvana is that it places his death several years after that of Buddha The traditions preserved in the Buddhist Pali canon clearly tell us that Niganthr Nataputta, i e Mahâvîra, died at Pava a little before Buddha [3] Jacobi and Charpentier have rather lightly set aside this old Buddhist tradition They have also been wrong in denouncing the traditional chronology of Jains as "absolutely valueless" [4] The chief reason for their so discrediting the Jain chronological traditions is based on their belief that it refers to the kings of Magadha As Charpentier observes, "As for the statements made in them, they are of a somewhat mysterious nature. Palaka, King of Avanti, is here mixed up with the Nanda and Maurya dynasties and Pusyamitra of Magadha, and with several rulers of Western India, among whom Gardabhila is elsewhere stated to have been the father of Vikramaditya, and Saka a prince belonging to the non-Indian dynasties of north-western India. Jacobi has already shown that the

introduction of King Palaka of Avanti into this list, which must from the beginning have been intended to give the names of the kings of Magadha, as Mahâvîra belonged to that country, seems highly suspicious."[5]

It is not correct to treat these Jain chronological traditions as referring to the kings of Magadha. In fairness to these traditions it should be noted that all the kings and dynasties mentioned in these are definitely known to be connected with Central and Western India; of course, some of them ruled over a big empire covering other parts of India including Magadha, about Palaka there is no doubt that he was the second king of the Pradyoṭa dynasty of Ujjain. About him Charpentier himself observes that he is "identical with Palaka, son and successor of Pradyota, King of Avanti, and brother of Vasavadatta, queen of the famous King Udayana of Vatsa. As this Udayana was a contemporary of Mahâvîra and Buddha, it is quite possible that his brother-in-law Palaka may have succeeded to the throne in a time nearly coinciding with the death of Mahâvîra"[6]. The Nandas too ruled over Western India. Nandivardhana the first king and the founder of the Nanda dynasty figures alike in the Pauranic list of the kings of Magadha as well as Ujjain. There is not the least doubt of the rule of the Mauryas over Central and Western India for which there is sample inscriptional as well as traditional evidence The same can be said about Pusyamitra and the Sunga dynasty he founded to which probably Balamitra and Bhanumitra of the Jain list also belong. Nahavana, who, as we shall see later on, is correctly identified with Nahapana, again undoubtedly belonged to Central and Western India. Gardabhila is also associated in Kalakacarya Katha[7] and other Jain traditions with Ujjain. He was driven out from here by the Sakas, whom Kalaka, according to the Kalakacarya Katha, brought to Ujjain from the western bank of the Indus *via* Saurastra. The traditions persistently aver that after a short rule the Sakas were driven out of Ujjain by Vikramaditya, son of Gardabhila Puranas also mention a Gardabhila dynasty of seven kings, which appear to be contemporary of the Andhras. After the Gardabhilas the Jain traditions have the Saka King. Saka rule in Central and Western India in the early centuries of the Christian era is also an

undoubted fact. It may not be difficult to find reason for the importance given by the Jains in their chronology to rulers of Central and Western India. With Ashoka's patronisation of Buddhism and the Sungas and the Kanvas after the Mauryas upholding the orthodox Brahmanism, the connection of Jains with Magadha and Eastern India became less and less intimate, and the scene of their activities shifted to Malwa and Western India with Ujjain as its chief centre.

Thus, it is wrong to treat these Jain chronological traditions as entirely valueless. It may be useful to estimate the truth underlying them by comparing these with other Jain chronological traditions and also with the Pauranic and the Buddhist traditions bearing on them. We must remember, as pointed out by Merutunga,[8] that in these traditions complete dynastic list in each case is not given and sometimes only certain important ruler is mentioned, and under his name total reign of the whole dynasty given

We have another Svetambara Jain chronological tradition, slightly different than the above, given in Titthagolipainnaya,[9] which gives the following chronology.

Palaka	60 years.
Nandas	150 years.
Mauryas	160 years.
Pusyamitra	35 years.
Balamitra and Bhanu Mitra	60 years.
Nabhasena	40 years.
Gadabhas	100 years.

This tradition also places the Saka King after Gadabhas, 605 years, after Mahâvîra's Nirvana

The Digambara sect of the Jains has preserved chronological traditions, which excepting in one or two important respects, are not far different from the Svetambara ones given above Tiloyapannati[10] and Jinsena's Harivamsa Purana[11], important Digambara texts, give the following chronology.

Palaka	60 years
Vijya Kings (Nandas ?)	155 years.
Muruda Kings (Mauryas ?)	40 years.
Pusyamitra	30 years.

Vasumitra and Agnimitra	60 years
Gandhavas or Rasabhas	100 years.
Narvahana	40 years.
Bhathatth aa (Satvahanas ?) ..	242 years.
Guptas	231 years.
Kalki	42 years.

This tradition thus gives 1000 years between the death of Mahâvîra and the end of the reign of Kalki. These Digambara texts also separately record that 605 years elapsed between Mahâvîra Nirvana and the Saka King, but unlike the Svetambara ones, they do not give any details of the reign-periods during this interval.

All the Jain traditions given above assign 60 years to Palaka. This may include as suggested above not only the reign-period of Palaka but also of his successors in his line Sixty year of reign-period for Palaka is implied by the tradition reported by Hemachandra who says that Nanda became king sixty years after Mahâvîra Nirvana [12] This probably refers to Nandivardhana, who succeeded Palakas dynasty in Ujjain. The Puranas record conflicting chronologies for the Pradyota dynasty. However certain Pauranic traditions seem to indicate that the five kings in Pradyota line all of whom appear to be his sons, perished after a reign of 52 years [13] This comes near the sixty years assigned to Pradyota's son palaka in the Jain traditions.

As regards the Nandas the Jain traditions given above mostly assign to them a period of 155 years On the other hand, as noticed above Hemachandra gives 155 years between the death of Mahâvîra and the accession of Chandragupta Maurya[14] which may not be far from the truth. If we knock out of it 60 years assigned by him as the period between the death of Mahâvîra and the accession of the Nanda king, it will leave 95 years for the Nandas. The Ceyloness Buddhist traditions seem to give 90 years to the same dynasty.[15] The Puranas again record conflicting chronological traditions about the Nanda dynasty. But a total of hundred years for all the Nandas is suggested by certain Pauranic traditions, which say that after the Nandas bad reigned for one hundred years Kautilya uprooted them, and the sovereignty passed on to the Mauryas.[16] This may be more or less correct tradition.

As regards the Mauryas, there seems to be great uncertainty about their reign-period in the Jain traditions given above. One Svetambara tradition assigns 160 years to them, another 108 years, and the Digambara traditions assign to this dynasty only 40 years. The last seems to be of no value as the reign-period, of the first three great Mauryas, Chandragupta, Bindusara and Ashoka, itself comes to 85 years according to the unanimous tradition recorded in the Puranas,[17] and 93 years according to the Ceylonese Buddhist traditions.[18] There is also no doubt, as is evidenced by inscriptional records as well as the traditional accounts, that the rule of these first three great Mauryas extended to Central and Western India. The association of Samprati, grandson of Ashoka and a great patron of Jainism, with Central and Western India is also very strongly attested by the Jain traditions.[19] Only in certain Puranas we get a complete record of the chronology of the Maurya kings, which is as follows[20] :

	Years.
Chandragupta	24
Bindusara	25
Ashoka	36
Kunala	8
Bandhupalita	8
Dasona	7
Dasaratha	8
Samprati	9
Salisuka	13
Devadharman or Devavarman	7
Satadhanvan	8
Brihadratha	7
Total	160

Against this total of 160 years obtained by adding the reign-periods of the various Maurya kings, some of the Puranas give a total of 137 years for this dynasty. A comparison of the Pauranic and the Jain traditions concerning the reign period of the Mauryas will make us give more credit to a total reign-period of 160 years to this dynasty. In any caste it must be noted that following certain Pauranic traditions referred to above if we assign 100 years to the Nandas and 160 years to the Mauryas we get a

total of 260 years for these two dynasties, which is very near 263 years (155-108) assigned to these two dynasties, in the traditions recorded in Tapagachha Pattavali as well as in Merutunga's Vicarsreni. If we take 263 years of these Jain traditions as the correct total for these two dynasties, whether we assign 155 years to the Nandas and 108 years to the Mauryas or 160 to the Mauryas and the remaining 103 years to the Nandas, it will not affect our enquiry regarding the date of Mahâvîra Nirvana.

After the Mauryas the Jain traditions assign 30 years to Pusyamitra, and after him some traditions assign 60 years to his son and grandson, Agnimitra and Vasumitra, others, Assign these 60 years to Balamitra and Bhanumitra, who also, as suggested above, appear to belong to the Sunga dynasty. Against the 90 years assigned to the Sungas in the Jain tradition, the Puranas assign a total reign-period of 112 years to this dynasty. This discrepancy between the Jain and the Pauranic total for this dynasty may be due to the fact that the Jain traditions give its reign-period in Central and Western India, whereas the Puranic traditions record the total reign-period of this dynasty in Magadha. As suggested by the rise of the Andhras, the influence of the Sungas ceased earlier in Central and Western India than perhaps in Magadha and Eastern India. The Sanchi inscriptions of the Andhra king Satakarni[21] may indicate that the influence of this dynasty had reached Central India in the first century B.C. On the other hand "its indeed doubtful if the Andhras ever ruled in Magadha" [22] Ninety years of the reign-period in Central and Western India assigned to the Sungas in the Jain records may be a correct tradition.

So far from Palaka down to the end of the Sungas the dynastic succession list, apart from differing reign-period in certain cases, is the same in all the Jain traditions. It is after this that serious discrepancy appears amongst the various Jain traditions. The Svetambara traditions quoted above from Merutunga's Vicarsreni, Tapagachha Pattavali and Titthagolipainnaya place 40 years of Nahavana after Balamitra and Bhanumitra. After Nahavana Tappagaccha Pattavali and Vicarsreni assign 13 years to Gardabhila and 4 to the Sakas. Then comes Vikramaditya. Vikramaditya, according to the Jain

traditions, was the son of Gardhabhila.[23] Vikramaditya and his dynasty can therefore be treated as the Gardabhilas. Merutunga's Vicarsreni gives 145 years to Vikramaditya and his dynasty or 152 years to the whole Gardabhila dynasty including the inter-regnum of 4 years for the Sakas. After the Gardabhila dynasty comes the Saka king. This happened 605 years after Mahâvîra Nirvana. Titthagotipainnya after Nahvana's 40 years assigns 100 years to the Gardbhas, by which apparently Gardabhilas are meant. No mention is made here separately of Gardabhila, the Sakas or Vikramaditya. One hundred years assigned to the Gardabhas in this tradition, perhaps, cover the thirteen years of Gardabhila, four of the Saka and after it the reign of Vikramaditya and his dynasty. This tradition also places after the Gardabhilas the Saka king, 605 years after Mahâvîra Nirvana.

The Digambara Jain traditions, on the other hand, after the sixty years of Vasumitra and Agnimitra assign one hundred years to the Gardabhilas, whom Tiloyapannati calle as Gandhavas and Hasivamsa Purana as Rasabhas. 'Rasabha' seems only a translation of Gardhava both meaning 'ass'[24] It is a common practice in Indian traditions to etymologically explain personal family and tribal names. We may recall the story given in the Kalakacarya Katha of the King Gardabhila being called by this name as he mastered the magic known as 'Gadabhi' 'she ass'. Elsewhere we have suggested that Gardabhila may be identical with Kharaveta of the Hathigumpha inscription fame. We have tried to show these that like Gardabhila Kharaveta also belonged to the first century B C Kharaveta's conqeust of Western and Central India are attested by his inscription. Gardabhila may be a translated form of the name Kharavela, "Khar" like 'Gardabha, also meaning ass. The same process of translation can be traced in Jinasena calling Gardabhilas and his dynasty as Rasabha-kings. Our surmise is that the dynasty founded by Kharavela is the same as the Gardabhilas of the Jain and the Pauranic traditions. If this surmise is correct then the 13 years of reign and conquest of Kharavela mentioned in the Hathigumpha inscription will correspond to the reign of 13 years assigned to Gardabhila in the Jain traditions in which case the victorious career of Kharevela and Gardalabila came to an end after his defeat by the Sakas. It

has also been surmised that Vakradeva of Kharavela's dynasty may be the famous Vikramaditya, who drove the Sakas out of Ujjain.[25]

After the Gardhavas or Rasabhas (Gardabhilas) these Digambara Jain traditions place Nahavana, whom they call as Narvahana, and these traditions also like the Svetambara ones assign him 40 years. After Nahavana comes Bhathatthanas, then the Guptas, and after the Guptas comes Kalki. These traditions count 1000 years betweeri the death of Mahâvîra and that of Kalki. It is interesting to note that these Digambar chronological traditions unlike the Svetambara ones do not refer to Vikramaditya They are preoccupied chiefly in establishing a chronology to show a difference of 1000 years between Mahâvîra Nirvana and Kalki. The Svetambara chronological traditions on the other hand are chiefly concerned with the Saka King who is placed 605 years after Mahâvîra Nirvana. They are not concerned with Kalki and do not carry the chronological list beyond the Saka King But the most important difference between the Digambara and the Svetambara Jain chronological traditions is that in the former Nahavana is placed after and in the latter before the Gardabhilas

Nahavana is undoubtedly, as is generally believed by modern historians, the same as Nahapana, the Mahakshatrap of Kshaharata family, who is mentioned in serveral inscriptions, an' a large number of whose coins is also discovered. The Nasik inscription of the Queen Gotami Balasri, mother of Gautamiputra Satakarni, informs us that her son Gautamiputra Satakarni rooted out the Khakharata (Kshaharata) family and restored the glory of the Satavahanas.[26] As pointed out by Jayaswal[27] according to the Jain traditions preserved in Avagyaka-sutra-niryukti it was Nahavana or Nahapana who was defeated and killed by the Satavahana king Gautamiputra Satakarni. This is also borne out by the fact that Gautamiputra Satakarni restruck the coins of Nahapana. The modern historical researches put Nahapana in the period after the comencement of the Vikrama era. Most of the scholars assign him to the end of the first and the beginning of the second century A D.[28] It seems that the Digambara chronological traditions are more correct in putting Nahavana or Nahapana

after the Gardabhilas, which will make him a post-Vikrama figure. He is wrongly put by the Svetambara traditions before Vikramaditya, or the Gardabhilas. As we have tried to show above the rest of the Svetambara chronological traditions preserved in Tapagaccha Pattavali and Merutunga's Vicarsreni from Palaka down to the first Saka occupation of Ujjain for four years and their being driven out of Malwa at the beginning of the Vikrama era, i.e. in 58 B C appear to be correct and reliable. If we take out 40 years of Nahavana from 470 years the interval given in these traditions between Mahâvîra Nirvana and the commencement of the Vikrama era, the difference between these two important events will be 430 years. This will give (430X58) 488 B C. as the date of Mahâvîra Nirvana. This will place Mahâvîra's death about a year before that of Buddha, who died as suggested above, in 487 B C These two dates will reconcile most of the Buddhist as well as the Jain traditions about these two great religious teachers

The conclusions set forth above may also throw new light on some other important dates in ancient Indian chronology If we follow the Jain traditions of Titthagotipainnya in assigning 160 years to the Mauryas, which, as discussed above, also seems to be the total of the individual reign-periods of the Maurya Kings given in certain Puranas, the placing of Nahavana in the post-Vikrama period gives us, according to the Svetambara chronology 267 years (160 Mauryas + 90 Sungas + 13 Gardabhila + 4 Sakas) between the beginning of the reign of Chandragupta Maurya and the commencement of the Vikrama era, i e 58 B C The commencement of the Chandragupta's reign will thus fall in (267+58) 325 B C , which as we have elsewhere[29] argued, on other grounds also appears to be the most likely case for the beginning of the reign of this great monarch.

Thirteen years assigned to Gardabhila in the Jain traditions will fall between 75 and 62 B.C After this come 4 years of the Saka occupation and then the reconquest of Ujjain by Vikramaditya which happened in 58 B C , To Vikramaditya and his dynasty Merutunga assigns 135 years. Kalakacaraya Katha also tells us that Vikramaditya' dynasty was uprooted by another

Saka King who established an era of his own when 135 years of the Vikrama era had elapsed[30] If we accept these as correct historical traditions we get (135-58) 77 A.D. as the end of the reign of the dynasty of Vikramaditya or their Gardabhila dynasty

As regards Nahavana or Nahapana, the critical examination of the Digambara and the Svetambara traditions given above and also the light thrown on him by modern researches make it clear that he came after the Gardabhilas. This will place the commencement of Nahavana's reign in 78 A.D. Nahavana in the Digambara Jain chronological traditions stands in the same place which is given to the Saka King in the Svetambara traditions This Saka King in both these traditions is placed in the post-Vikrama period about 605 yars after Mahâvîra Nirvana. It then appears that Nahavana or Nahapana is the Saka King of both these traditions, who, as discussed above, in the Svetambara traditions is put by mistake also before Gardabhila Nahapana, according to the inscriptions, belonged to Kshaharata family, which was of the Saka extraction We know from the inscriptions that the Saka rulers Liaka, Patika, Ghataka and Bhumika were other members of the same Kshaharata family Ushavadata, son-in-law of Nahapana, is distinctly mentioned as a Saka in these inscriptions

The conclusion we have drawn from the critical study of the various Jain traditions that Nahapana was the Saka King whose rule commenced from 78 A D., makes us also conclude that he is the founder of the Saka era of 78 A D All the Jain traditions assign 40 years of reign of Nahavana or Nahapana, whose reign therefore lasted upto 605 years (430 between Mahâvîra Nirvana and Vikrama) + 135 of Vikrama's dynasty +40 of Nahavana) after Mahâvîra Nirvana It thus seems that the Jain counting of 605 years between Mahâvîra Nirvana and the Saka King, perhaps, refers to the period between the death of Mahâvîra and that of Nahavana. Starting with the commencement of the reign of Nahavana or Nahapana in 78 A.D. the end of his forty years' reign will fall in 118 A.D. which will then be the date of the defeat of Nahapana by Gautamiputra Satakarni.

References

1 "Buddha Nirvana and some other dates in ancient Indian Chronology" Indian culture Vol V No 3 p 305 ff, and also "chronology of Asokan Inscription" Journal of Indian History, Vol XVII, Part 3

2 Cam Hist of India Vol I p 156

3 Digha Nikaya III pp 117, 209, and Majjhima Nikaya, II, pp 243 ff We are told here that while Buddha stayed at Samagama, the report was brought to him that his rival had died at Pava and that the Nigranthas, his followers, were divided by serious scheme According to Jain traditions also Mahâvîra died at Pava

4 Compare the following remark of Charpentier about the Jain chronology given above, "the list is absolutely valueless, as it confuses rulers of Ujjain, Magadha, and other kingdoms, and some of these may perhaps have been contemporary, and not successive as they are represented" Camb History of India Vol I, p 155

5 IA Vol XLIII, p 121

6 Ibid P 121

7 W N Brown The story of Kalaka

8 इह यदा यो राजा रव्यातिमानभृत, तदा
तस्य राज्य गण्यते, न तु पट्टानुक्रम ---Vicarsreni

9 ज रयणि सिद्धिगओ अरहा तित्थकरो महावीरो।
त रयणि अवतीए अभिसित्तो पालवो राया।।६२०।।
पालगरण्णो सट्ठी पुण पण्णसय वियाणि नन्दाण।
मुरियाण सट्ठीसय पणतीसा पूसमित्ताण।।६२१।।
बलमित्त-भाणुमित्ता सट्ठा चत्ता य होंति नभसेणे।
गद्दभ सय एक पुण पडिवन्नो तो सगो राया।।६२२।।
पच मासा पच य वासा छच्चेव होंति वाससया।
परिनिव्वुअस्सऽरिहतो तोउप्पन्नो सगो राया।।६२३।।
Shantilal Shah "The traditional chronology of the Jainas' p 16 f
Shah regards Tithagolipainnya as the oldest Jain chronological work He assigns it to the early part of the fourth century A D
The above verses from Tithagolipainnya are also quoted by Muni Darshan Vijya in his "Pattavli Samucaya" P 197

10 जक्काले वीरजिणो णिस्सेयस सपय समावण्णो।
तक्काले अभिसित्तो पालयणामो अवतिसुदो।।१५०५।।
पालरज्ज सट्ठि इगिसयपणवण्णा विजयवसभवा।
चाल मुरुदयवसो तीस वस्सा सुपुस्समित्तस्स।।१५०६।।
वसुमित्त अग्गिमित्ता सट्ठी गधव्वया वि सयमेक्क।
णरवाहणा य चाल तत्तो भत्थट्टणा जादा।।१५०७।।
भत्थट्टणाण कालो दोण्णिसयाइ हवति बादाला।
तत्तो गुत्ता ताण रज्जे दोण्णि य सयाणि इगितीसा।।१५०८।।
तत्तो कक्की जादो इदसुदो तस्स चउमुहो णामो।
सत्तरि वरिसा आऊ विगुणियइगिवीस रज्जतो।।१५०९।।
णिव्वाणे वीरजिणे छव्वाससदेसु पचवरिसेसु।
पणमासेसु गदेसु सजादो सगणिओ अहवा।।१४९९।।
Tiloyapannati (Jivaraja Granthmala Sholapur, under print)

11 वीरनिर्वाणकाले च पालकोऽत्राभिषिच्यते। लोकेऽवन्तिसुतो राजा प्रजाना प्रतिपालक ।।४८७।।
षष्टिवर्षाणि तद्राज्य ततो विषयभूभुजा। शत च पचपचाशद्वर्षाणि तदुदीरित।।४८८।।
चत्वारिंशत्पुरूढाना भूमडलमखडित। त्रिशत्तु पुष्यमित्राणा षष्टिर्वस्वग्निमित्रयो:।।४८९।।
शत रासभराजाना नरवाहनमायत । चत्वारिंशत्ततो द्वाभ्या चत्वारिंशच्छतद्वय।।४९०।।

भद्रवाणस्य तद्राज्यं गुप्तानां च शतद्वयं। एकविंशश्च वर्षाणि कालविद्भिरुदाहृतं।।४९१।।
द्विचत्वारिंशदेवातः कल्किराजस्य राजता। ततोऽजितंजयो राजा स्यादिंद्रपुरसंस्थितः।।४९२।।
वर्षाणां षट्शतीं त्यक्त्वा पंचाग्रं मासपंचकं। मुक्ति गते महावीरे शकराजस्ततोऽभवत।।५५१।।
मुक्तिंगते महावीरे प्रतिवर्षसहस्रकं। एकैके जायते कल्की जिनधर्मविरोधकः।।५५२।।
Jinasena Harivanasa Purana Ch 60
In the manuscript of this work used by K B Pathak, Guptas are given 231 years (गुप्ताना च शतद्वयम्। एक त्रिंशच्च वर्षाणि कालविद्भिरुदाहतम्।।)
(In Ant Vol XV P 142 If we assign 231 years to the Guptas then only we shall get 1000 years mentioned in these traditions as the interval between the death of Mahâvîra and that of Kalki 231 years for The Guptas also given in Tileryapannati appear to be the correct version
The Ms used by Pathak has Muruda instead of Puruda and Bhathavana instead of Bhadravana The Ms used by Jayaswal (In An Vol 46) has Vijya instead of Vishya and Bhattavana instea of Bhadravana

12 अनन्तर वर्द्धमानस्वामिनिर्वाण-वासरात्।।
गतायां षष्टिवत्सरयमेष नन्दोऽन्नभवृपः।। (परि० ६, २४३)

13 Pargiter D K A P 68

14 एव च श्रीमहावीरमुक्तेर्वर्षशते गते।
पच-पचाशदधिके चन्द्रगुप्तोऽभवन्नृपः।। (परि० ८, ३३९)

15 Susunaga 18
Kalasoka 28
Ten sons of Kalasoka 22
Nine Nandas 22 Calm Hist of India Vol I P 189
Susunaga of the Buddhist traditions has been correctly identified with Nandwardhana and Kalasoka with Mahanandin by S N Pradhan, "Chronology of Ancient India" P 220 ff

16 Pargiter, DKA P 69

17 The Puranas give the following reign-periods for these monarchs
Chandragupta 24 years Bindusara 25 years and Ashoka 36 years
Pargiter DKA P 70

18 The traditions as preserved in Mahavamsa give the following chronology of the reign of these three kings Chandragupta 24 years, Bindusara 28 years, Ashoka 41 years (four years before his coronation and 37 years after it)

19 We gather from the Jain work Dipalika Kalpa of Jinsundera that Samprati became king of Ujjain 300 years after Mahâvîra Nirvana
दिनतो मम मोक्षस्य गते वर्षशतत्रये। उज्जयिन्यां महापुर्यां भावी संप्रति भूपतिः।।

20 Pargiter DKA
Also compare Cam. Hist of India Vol I P 511

21 Liders, 'List of Brahmi Inscriptions No 346'

22 Cambridge History of India Vol I , p 224

23 Merutinga's Vicarsreni

24 Brown The story of Kalaka

25 Nagpur University Journal, No 8

26 Lider's Brahmi Inscription No 1123

27 JBORS Vol 16 (1930) P 248 ff

28 Vincent Smith, Rapson, R G Bhandarkar and Raychaudhri give C 125 A D as the date for the defeat of Nohapana by the Andhra King Gautamiputra Satakarni

29 "Beginning of Chandragupta Maurya's Reign" Proceeding of the III Indian History Congress (1939) p 371 , also Journal of Indian History, Vol XIX , Part 1

30 Brown The Story of Kalaka p 60

8

MAHÂVÎRA'S CONTEMPORARY KINGS*

—K.C. Shah

Jainas have preserved complete itinerary of Mahâvîra after he took Diksa Muni Kalyanavijaya has arranged this itinerary in a chronological order [1] From its study we gather much information of great historical value

First I give below the relevant items of the itinerary—

(1) During his 42nd year Mahâvîra visited Kausambi before monsoon King Satanika was reigning there at that time

During his 44th year he again visited Kausambi after monsoon King Udayana was on the throne As he was a minor, his mother, Queen Mrgavati, was carrying on the administration as a regent

During his 49th year he passed the rainy season in Rajagrha and then moved on to Kausambi King Udayana was still a minor However entrusting him to the care of king Pradyota of Avanti, who was her sister's husband, Queen Mrgavati took Diksa

(2) During his 48th and 49th years he passed the rainy seasons in Rajagrha King Srenika, who was old at the time, had visited him with the members of the royal family during his stay

During his 52nd and 54th years he again passed the rainy seasons in Rajagrha but no member of the royal family had visited him

During his 54th year after the rainy season he moved on from Rajagrha to Campa where king Kunika was staying There he was visited by the King and other members of the royal family

During his 55th year after passing the rainy season in Mithila he again moved on to Campa The war between King

* Journal of the Oriental Institute, Vol 4 1955

Kunika and King Cetaka of Vaisali had already started and was taking a very severe turn at this time.

(3) During his 56th year after passing the rainy season in Mithila he visited Sravasti Here he had a quarrel with Gosalaka from which he contracted illness. This illness continued and took a very serious turn during the first month of his 57th year. However fortunately he recovered before monsoon. During this time he had disagreement with Jamali, who was his son-in-law and disciple, and who separated from him as a result of this disagreement.

I hold the view that Mahâvîra died during October of the 468th year before Christ i e in 468 B.C., and that he was born 71 years and about $5\frac{1}{2}$ months earlier, i.e. in April, 539 B C. On this basis I shall now try to arrange the historical information obtained from these items.

(a) In 498 B.C King Satanika was reigning in Kausambi but in 495 B C we find the minor king Udayana on the throne. It is clear that Satanika must have died during this interval, say, roughly about 497 B.C In 490 B C. King Udayana was still a minor and King Pradyota was reigning in Avanti. All the Jaina writers unanimously state that Palaka was crowned King of Avanti on the same night on which Mahâvîra obtained Nirvana. The Puranas give the reign of 23 years to Pradyota and place Palaka as the successor of Pradyota.[2] Hence Pradyota must have become king of Avanti in 491 B.C.

(b) In 492 B.C. old king Srenika was reigning in Rajagrha, but in 488 and 486 B.C there was no member of the royal family in Rajagrha It is known that Kunika had succeeded Srenika and after his accession to the throne he had a quarrel with his brothers for the possession of the elephant, Canaka. The brothers went to their maternal grandfather, King Cetaka of Vaisali for protection, and consequently a war between Kunika and Cetaka ensued.[3] In order to make arrangements and efficient handling of it Kunika had moved on to Campa from Rajagrha In 485 B C Kunika was in Campa and in 484 B.C the war had already started and had taken a very severe turn. It is clear that King Srenika must have died some time between 492 B.C and 488 B.C. Also the quarrel between the brothers, the intervention of the grand-father and his

failure, and the starting of the war all these must have taken not less than four to five years As Kunika was in Campa for the purpose of the war in 484 B.C it can safely be assumed that king Srenika must have died about 490 B.C.

(c) In 483 B.C. Mahâvîra had serious illness and had also a quarrel with Jamali. This led to the rumour of the Mahâvîra death and the consequent split in the Jaina church, which was heard by Buddha, when he was in Samagama [4] Buddha died one year after this incident Hence his death falls in 482 B.C As his death had taken place in eighth year of the reign of King Ajatasatru (Kunika)[5], Kunika's accession to the throne falls in 490 B.C. which tallies with the year arrived at in the previous para from other considerations.

The Puranas give the reign of 25 years to Ajatasatru (Kunika) and also of 25 years to his successor Darsaka.[6] Hence we get the following chronological order—

497 B C Death of King Satanika and accession of the minor King Udayana at Kausambi.

491 B C. Accession of King Pradyota at Avanti.

490 B.C. Death of King Srenika (Bimbasara) and accession of King Kunika (Ajatasatru) Rajagrha.

482. B C Nirvana of Buddha

468. B C Death of King Pradyota and accession of King Palaka at Avanti

465 B C. Death of King Kunika and accession of King Darsaka at Rajagrha.

It is also known that King Udayana had married in his youth Vasavadatta, the daughter of King Pradyota and had also married at a slightly advanced age Padmavati,[7] the sister of King Darsaka. Besides it is known that Srenika had married the sister of King Prasenajit of Kosala and Kunika had married his daughter, Vajiri After the untimely death of Vidudabha, the son and successor of king Prasenajit it appears that Kunika took hold of Kosala and annexed it to Magadha. It is thus clear that Satanika, Srenika and Prasenajit belonged to the same generation, Kunika, Vidudabha and Pradyota to the next generation, while Udayana, Palaka and Darsaka belonged to the third generation. By generation I mean here the same order of age.

References

1 Sramana Bhagavan Mahâvîra—a book in Hindi by Muni Kalyanavijaya chapters 2 and 3.
2 Pargiter · Dynasties of Kali Age, p. 68
3. Bhagavati Sutra Sataka 7, Uddesaka 9
4 Majjhima Nikaya Samagama Suttanta
6 Pargiter : Dynasties of Kali Age, p. 69
7 Kathasaritsagara
Svapnavasavadattam

9

A NOTE ON THE RELATION OF PARASVANATHA AND MAHÂVÎRA WITH KALINGA*

—A.K. Rath

Jaina literature throws ample light on the relation of Parsvanatha and Mahâvîra with Kalinga (Orissa) which they had visited to preach their religion Their visit to Kalinga reveals the remote antiquity of Jainism in Kalinga and traces its history to a period earlier than that of the rise of Buddhism The preachings of Parsvanatha and Mahâvîra contributed immensely to the rise and spread of Jainism as a popular religion in Kalinga as early as the sixth century B C before it became the state religion under Kharavela and his successors [1] Kalinga was also regarded as a country suitable for the wanderings (on preaching tours) of the Jaina monks[2] because of its close contact with the last two Tirthankaras

Parsvanatha, the twenty-third Tirthankara, was the first to preach Jainism in its Chaturyama form in Kalinga The Jaina Kshetra samasa represents Parsvanatha as preaching at Kopakataka where he became the guest of one of his devotees called Dhyana He broke his fast on the second day of his meditation in the house of Dhyana Kopakataka has been identified with Kopari in the Balasore district of Orissa[3] and it is no other than the village Komparaka of the Neulpur inscription[4] of Subhakaradeva I (690 A D.), the Bhaumakara king of Orissa At Kopari there is a nearby hill containing some caves which bear silent witness to the memory of the Jaina monks who lived here evidently as early as the days of Parsvanatha

* Indian History Congress, 1951

The Jaina Uttaradhyayanasutra[5] and the Kumbhakara Jataka[6] refer to Karakandu, the king of Kalinga, as a great disciple of Parsvanatha. Karakandu was a contemporary of Nagnajit, the king of Gandhara, Nimi, the king of Videha, Durmukha, the king of Panchala and Bhima, the king of Vidarbha, who have all followed Parsvanatha and adopted the Jaina faith[7] As Parsvanatha is said to have lived in the 8th century B.C.[8] Karakandu and his contemporaries may be assigned to a period between 800 B C and 600 B C

The Parsvanatha Charita[9] of Bhabadeva Suri narrates an interesting story about an invasion of the kingdom of Prasenjit by the ruler of Kalinga called Yavana and the part played by Parsvanatha in defending that kingdom The story says that when Prasenjit, the king of Kusasthalapura, had decided to give his daughter, Prabhavati, in marriage to Parsva, the son of king Asvasena of Varanasi, the Kalinga king Yavana out of jealousy invaded Kusasthalapura. Consequently Prasenjit appealed for help to Asvasena who at once deputed Parsva to the rescue of Prasenjit With the arrival of Parsva at Kusasthalapura, Yavana 'decided not to fight and finally withdrew to his kingdom' In the absence of any corroborative evidence it is difficult to accept the authenticity of this story. However, the above Jaina literary works throw considerable light on the spread of Jainism in Kalinga as early as the days of Parsvanatha, i e c. 8th century B.C.

Mahâvîra, the twenty-fourth Tirthankara, was more intimately associated with Kalinga which consequently became a stronghold of the Jainas The Harivamsa Purana of Jinasena[10] states that Mahâvîra visited Kalinga to preach Jainism in its Panchayama form He propogated his doctrines in Kalinga at the behest of its ruler who happened to be a friend of his father.[11] The Hathigumpha Inscription[12] reveals that Mahâvîra preached from the Kumari Parvata (modern Udayagiri near Bhubaneswar).

It is said that Mahâvîra had reached Toshali after visiting places like Valuyagama Subhoma, Suchetta, Malaya and Hathisisa where he had to undergo extreme physical torture These places have been located in the Koshala region of North Western Orissa.[13] Of these places Subhoma may be identified with Suvarnapura (modern Sonepur in the Balangir district of

western Orissa) of the Somavamsi, Bhanja and Chola records[14] of the mediaeval period, and Malaya may be identified with Malayagiri or Malyagiri near Pallahara in the Dhenkanal district.[15] Some Jaina antiquities are also found at these places

The Avashyaka Sutra records the tradition regarding Mahâvîra's visit to Toshali (modern Dhauli near Bhubaneswar), the capital of Kalinga—"Tatto Bhagabam Toshalim Gao.....Tattha Sumagaho Namo Rathio Piyamit to Bhagabao So Maae Tato Sami Moshalim Gao" [16] At Toshali he was suspected to be a robber and was about to be hanged. But he was rescued through the timely intervention of the Toshali Kshatriyas [17] From Toshali he went to Moshali where also he was caught under suspicion of being a dacoit, but was soon released when his identity was revealed. Moshali is no other than Ptolemy's Maisoloi or Maisola[18] which probably extended from the agencies of the Ganjam district upto the Godavari delta. Mahâvîra's visit to Maisoloi (Mashali) is also corroborated by the Jaina Uttara-dhyayana Sutra[19] which states that Pihunda, a port of Kalinga, had been an important seat of Jainism since the days of Mahâvîra Sylvain Levi[20] has identified Pihunda with Pithunda of the Hathigumpha inscription, and it is located by Ptolemy in the country of Maisoloi (Moshali) near Srikakulam and Kalingapatnam.

The Jaina Bhagawati Sutra states that during his early wanderings Mahâvîra visited places like Kumagrama and Siddhartha Grama in the company of Gosala, the Ajivika teacher At Kumagrama he saw an ascetic called Vesayana, who was then practising Yoga by looking at the hot rays of the sun and raising both arms upward, while his body was swarming with lice [21] In this connection the present writer is inclined to cite the Banapur[22] and the Parikud[23] copper plates of Madhyamaraja (c 662-690 A.D.) of the Sailoddhava dynasty of Kangoda which state that in order to attain supreme heavenly peace the sages of Kangoda were performing meditation by looking attentively at the thousand hot rays of the burning sun which caused often mutilation on their faces. Thus the type of severe ascetic discipline are Yoga practised by Vesayana as state above was also popular in Kangoda which extended from the river Mahanadi to the Mahendra region of the Ganjam and the Srikakulam districts of

Orissa and Andhra Pradesh respectively. Kurmagrama, therefore, may be located in Kangoda and identified with Srikumam of the Sri kakulam district. Perhaps, Mahâvîra visited Kurmagrama to learn the type of Yogic practice followed by Vesayana, a sage of Kangoda.

From Kurmagrama Mahâvîra and Gosala proceeded to Siddhartha ka Grama where Gosala severed his connection with Mahâvîra owing to his differences with the latter and established a separate sect known as Ajivika.[24] This Siddharthagrama, the place of origin of the Ajivika sect, may also be located in the Kangoda-Kallinga region and may be identified with Siddharthaka Grama of Varaha-vartini Vishaya of some copper plate inscriptions of the early Gangas of Kalinga such as the Achyutapuram plates[25] of Indravarman of Ganga era 87, and the Siddhantam plates[26] of Devendravarman of the Ganga era 196. Sri G Ramdas[27] has rightly identified Siddharthaka Grama with modern Siddhantam about four Kms. from Srikurmam. It may be noted that the same village was also called Sidhata in the Masunika grant[28] of Devendravarman of the Ganga era 306. Thus Siddharthagrama of the time of Mahâvîra was known as Siddharthaka Grama, Sidhata and Siddhantam in different ages. It was so named evidently in honour of Mahâvîra's father, Siddhartha, a friend of the king of Kalinga

It is known from the Tekkali plates[29] that the Matharas of Kalinga under Umavarman (c 330-362 A.D.) has acquired an important town at the foot of Mahendragiri called Vardhamanapura, evidently named after Vardhamana Mahâvîra who had visited that place. It has been located[30] in the Tekkali region which is quite close to Kumagrama and Siddhartha Grama Line 12 of the Hathigumpha inscription reveals the antiquity of the Jaina image worship in Kalinga as early as the 5th century B.C. when it states that the image of the Jina of Kalinga which had been previously taken away from Kalinga by Nandaraja (Mahapadmananda) to Magadha was brought back by Kharavela This Jina may be identified with Mahâvîra[31] in view of the fact that he had preached his religion at several places of Kalinga and was therefore in high esteem by its people This image was probably installed soon after Mahâvîra's departure

from Kalinga which served as a token of reverence of the people of Kalinga for Mahâvîra.

Thus Parsvanatha and Mahâvîra played a significant role in the history of the rise and spread of early Jainism in Kalinga.

References

1. The Hathigumpha Inscription of Kharavela, (J B O S S Vol III, Part IV (1917) pp 425 ff and Vol XIII (1927) Parts III and IV, pp 221-246, also B M Barua The old inscriptions in the Udaygiri and Khandagiri Caves, Calcutta, 1922
2. Jambndvipapannatti, Ch p 107
3. N N Basu, Archaeological Survey of Mayurbhanj p XLIII
4. E I , Vol XV pp 1-9, also B Mishra, Dynasties of Medieval Orissa, p 16
5. Utturadhyayana Sutra, Ch 18, Vs 45-47
6. Jataka III, pp 376 f, Indian Culture, Vol IV, p 79
7. Herman Jacobi, S B E XIV, p 87, Lecture XVIII, 45-47
8. Sinclair Stevenson, The Heart of Jainism, p 48
9. Parsvanatha Charita by Sri Bhabaldeva Suri, edt by Haragovinda and Beacharadasa, pp 269-270 Slokas 155 ff, also Pargiter Ancient Indian Historical Tradition, p 146
10. R D Banerjee, History of Orissa, Vol I, p 61
11. The Haribnadriya Vritti (Agamodaya Samiti) pp 218-20, J B O R S , Vol III, p 223
12. Line 14 of the Hathigumpha Insription, J B O R S , Vol III, p 246 and Vol X III , p 228
13. K C Jain, Lord Mahâvîra and his Times, p 54
14. B Mishra, Dynasties of Mediaeval Orissa pp 66-72 and pp 78-79 Calcutta, (1933)
15. N K Sahu U U History of Orissa, V o l I, p 140
16. The Avashyaka Sutra, pp 219-20
17. Vide Nayadhammakahao Ch 17, p 210, edt, by N N Vaidva, 1940 (Poona)
18. Ptolemy, VII-I, 15 and 93
19. Uttaradhyayana Sutra XXI 1-4 Indian Culture Vol XIII, p 20
20. I A , LV, 1926 pp 14f, N K Sahu U U History of Orissa, Vol I p 87 f
21. K C Jain, Lord Mahâvîra and his times, p 47
22. Lines 32-34, Rajguru, Insc of Orissa, Vol I, Part II, p 193, also E I Vol XXX pp 33-38
23. E I, Vol XI, pp 281-7 lines 23-25
24. Uvasaqdasao, Tr A FR Hoernle, Calcutta, 1888, App I
25. E I Vol III, pp 127-30 also Insc of Orissa, Vol II, pp 24-28 ff
26. E I Vol XIII, pp 212-216 ff, also Insc of Orissa, Vol II, pp 81-85
27. Ibid
28. J A H R S , Vol, XVIII, p 115
29. Rajguru, Insc of Orissa, Vol I, Part II, pp 4-6
30. B V Krishna Rao, Early Dynasties of Andhradesa, p 322
31. N K Sahu has identified the Jina with Rishavanath (UU Hist of Orissa, Vol I p 228) while Jayswal identified with Sitalanatha (E I Vol XX, p 85)

10

MAHÂVÎRA & BUDDHA

—Kamta Prasad

"How to emancipate man from the trammels of the world", has been the subject of a rational speculation to Indian philosophers from time immemorial The Jainas say that it was their first Tirthankara, Lord Rsabha, whom the Buddhists named as an ancient monarch of India and an omniscient Jain Teacher[1] and who is regarded as the eighth incarnation of Visnu by the Brahmanas[2], was in fact, that first great teacher of the world, who showed the right path to the suffering humanity at the very dawn of civilisation, when the Stone age ended to give place to that of Agriculture The Dharma thus preached by the first Lord of mankind was soon lost in dark oblivion and the Tirthankaras and Buddhas one after another followed him Lord Parsva just preceded Mahâvîra and Buddha, being the 23rd of the 24 Tirthankaras, who also preached Ahinsa Dharma. But the people were so highly infatuated in sensual gratification that the bloody sacrifices and licentiousness became dominant Truth was ignored.

Early Life

When such was the condition of Indian community and the philosophical controversy, also wrought a havoc, then there appeared two great heroes. The darkness of ignorance in which the atmosphere plunged, took to its heels before these two luminous stars who came of Ksatriya Sramanas, Buddha and Mahâvîra were known as Sakyaputra and Jnatraputra respectively. Suddhodana, the father of Buddha, was a democratic head of the clan of the Sakyas; so was the father of Mahâvîra Raja Siddhartha of the clan of Jnatras. Buddha was born at Kapilvastu, Mahâvîra in the town of Kundagrama, which

was a flourishing suburb of Vaishali and the metropolis of the Jnatras. Buddha's mother died soon after his birth; Mahâvîra's parents lived to see him a grown up youth Since the birth of Mahâvîra caused an increment of their wealth, fame and merit (punya), his parents named him as Varddhamana. Buddha married a lady named Yasodhara; Mahâvîra lived a house holder's life in celibacy, practising the first vows—the Silavratas of a layman. Mahâvîra's parents professed the religion of the Tirthankars and worshipped Parsvanatha. Similar seems to be the belief of the parents of Buddha, who were also followers of previous Buddhas Siddhartha Gautama while enjoying the worldly life got disgusted with it and renounced the world against the will of his father at the age of about 29. Mahâvîra while passing a pious householder's life and meditating upon the true nature of things, gained insight of Truth and adopted the great vows of a Nirgrantha Sramana, with the consent of his parents, when he was 30 years of age

Saintly Life As Sramanas

As an ascetic, Buddha's course of adherence was not a fixed one In his search for Truth, Gautama followed almost every cult of asceticism prevailing at the time Once he came across a Sramana named Pihitasrava belonging to the Order of Tirthankara Parsva and took the ordination of a Digambara Jaina Muni from him, but he could not agree with the conception of hard penances of the Nirgranthas and founded his Middle Path[3]. This assertion of the Jainas has been corroborated by the declaration of Gautama Buddha himself in which he said that he suffered the hardship of going about naked, performed the practice of uprooting and pulling out the hairs of beard and head and took meals standing, in the palm of his hands,[4] which are the fundamental practices of Naganya (nudity), kesalunchana (pulling out of hairs) and chariya (rules regarding meals) of a Jaina sramana [5]

Mahâvîra, on the other hand, followed the course of a Nirgrantha sramana and set himself to search out the Truth in a scientific manner He studied the prevailing conditions and phenomenon in a psychological way and strange it was that he got many a ill cured without uttering a word from his mouth. The

burning problems of the day naturally attracted his attention and though a novice he set such an example that the evils of slavary, caste superiority, female suffering and bloody sacrifices were removed.

As a *Nirgrantha* ascetic. Mahâvîra completely subdued all of his emotions and desires. Consequently he forgot and overcame the sensual perception of good and evil. He first of all gave himself up to deep meditation and hard penance for a period of twelve years. During this period he suffered all the hardship of an ascetic's life in silence and fortitude; as he remained lost in the inner beauty of his Soul. He was in reality engaged in his attempt to realise his self and so much absorbed was he in studying the spritual advancement within, that he had not the inclination to become satisfied with outward things only. His spiritual progress was indeed a miracle of will-power and Dr. Felix Valyi is justified when he remarks that "The most striking feature in the genius of Mahâvîra from the psychological point of view is the tremendous will-power which characterises every act of his career during the most significant century in the history of human thought. Deliberately, without a single moment of hesitation of doubt, Mahâvîra proceeds to demonstrate in his own example how the human mind can be disciplined and controlled in such a way that the highest intellectual and spiritual level can be attained in a single life time. Among the Saints of the Sixty Century B.C. in India, there were probably thousands who tried each in his own way to attain complete mastery over human nature, but only two impressed the consciousness of the Indian people to the extent to which the historian can attach world significance. Only Mahâvîra and the Buddha created powerful movements which inspired the greatest of the centuries of Indian history."[6]

The Great Achievement of Mahâvîra

The great achievement of life came to Mahâvîra during the thirteenth year of his penance. It brought forth the ripe and unique fruit of his hard perseverance. Mahâvîra became a *Jina* (Spiritual Victor), *Tathagata* (Accomplished one), a *Tirthankara* (maker of a crossing ford, i.e. Dharma) or an omniscient Teacher, Gautama Buddha also came to know of the great achievement of the Jaina Tirthankara and once he remarked—

"There are, brethren, certain recluses who thus preach and believe : whatever an individual experiences, whether it be happy or painful, or neutral feeling, all has been caused by previous actions. And thus from the cancelling of old actions by *tapas*, and by abstaining from doing new actions, there is no influx into future life; by this non-influx *Karma* is destroyed, and so all pain will become worn away. This brethren what the Nirgranthas (Jains) say. Is it true, I asked them, that you believe and declare this ? . They replied 'Our leader Nataputta (Mahâvîra), is all wise out of the depth of his (perfect) knowledge he tells us · 'Ye have done evil in the past this ye do wear away by this hard course of action And the discipline that here and now, by thought, word and deed, is wrought, is a minus quantity of bad *Karma* in future life . thu all *Karma* will eventually be worn away and all pain To this we assent '—*Majjhima, II 214ff.*

On another occasion Gautama Buddha introduced Tirthankara Jnatraputra Mahâvîra as "the head of an order, of a following, the teacher of a school of thought, well known and of repute, as a sophist, revered by the people, a man of experience, who has long been a recluse, old and well stricken in years "[7]

The Buddhist records corroborate the claim of the Jainas that their Master was "allknowing and allseeing and endowed with unlimited knowledge and vision " No doubt, Mahâvîra figures as supremely gifted Ksatriya Teacher and Leader of Thought who was acknowledged as a great guardian, a great guide and a great preacher He wash the last Tirthankara, around whom many hundreds and thousands of votaries assembled to honour and worship him [8]

Thus, as pointed out rightly by Dr. H. Zimmer, Mahâvîra "in contrast to the Buddha is never described as having first become a disciple of teachers whose doctrines failed to satisfy him. Mahâvîra remained faithful to the tradition in to which he had been born and which he embraced fully when he became a Jain monk By attaining to the highest goal envisioned in this tradition—a very rare achievement—he did not refute, but only gained new fame for the ancient way."[9]

The Enlightenment of Buddha

On the contrary, Gautama Buddha found an intellectual

enlightenment, which led him to preach the Middle Course. When faced with the severity of parisha-jaya (mortification which signifies cheerfully enduring all kinds of hardships incidental to asceticism, and finding them only leading to enfeeblement and emanciation, but not to the enlightenment that he sought) which requires spiritual discipline also, Buddha declared—

"Not by this bitter course of painful hardship shall I arrive at that separate and supreme vision of all sufficing, noble (Aryan) knowledge, passing human ken. Might there be not another path to enlightenment ?"[10]

He thenceforth began to look after the welfare of the body once more. At last the middle course that he was looking for occurred to him under the famous Bo tree. It was a compromise between rigid asceticism on the one hand and the life of unrestrained licentiousness under the guise of Karma yoga (the doing of all worldly actions, but without attachment to their fruits) on the other.[11] Thus Buddha preached his noble Middle Path which was his own finding and established his own Order to Bhikkhus.

Dharma-Chakra set Rolling

After attaining omniscience Varddhamana Mahâvîra, like the Buddha, set rolling the Great Wheel of Truth, called *dharmachakra*, which was first started by Rsabha in a hoary antiquity and a fascimile of which in stone artistically completed existed since long at Taksasila[12] Mathura[13] and Khandagiri-Udayagiri in Orissa.[14] But even on his achievement as Kevala-jnani (all seeing and allknowing teacher) under the Sal tree on the bank of Rijukula river near Jrambhika Mahâvîra remained silent for no less than sixty-six days. Though He appeared silent outwardly, but in fact, He was communicating in a psychological form with every phenomenon of the world. Mahâvîra, thus, vibrated a ray of spiritual light throughout the whole of universe. The occults realised it and the lord of the celestials hastened to come to him. Even by his silence Mahâvîra created miracles. He knew well that example is better than precept. So though observing silence. He always endeavoured to make the Truth shine in its nakedness in every walk of life. He then moved from Jrambhika to Rajgir. Indra, the lord of heavens,

provided a very beautiful Preaching Hall for the Lord on the summit of the Vipula mount, to which even the animals had access; but the Tirthankara was still silent. How could be preach Ahinsa and Anekanta when the atmosphere was laden with the abhorring smell of Himsa and Hatred ? Indra realised it. He went to Indrabhuti Gautama, who was residing near Nalanda & was the acknowledged leader of the bloody sacrifices and empty rituals and brought him in the presence of Mahâvîra. Now the golden opportunity had arrived . Mahâvîra foresaw the importance of the conversion of Indrabhuti Gautama. Accordingly, He delivered his first sermon to him asking him convinced of the same life to be found in every living being : so the man should regard every living being equal to his own soul and be as asiduous in cherishing the life of others as his own. The Sermon of Compassion had its own influence : forthwith Indrabhuti Gautama with his hundred of disciples took refuge in His lotus-feet and thus ended the bloody sacrifices in no time.

From Rajgriha Mahâvîra started his preaching tour all over Aryavarta. He visited almost all the important cities and towns of India, namely Nalanda, Vaishali; Vaniyagrama, Kumariparvata, Pataliputra, Champa Sravasti, Ayodhya, Baranasi, Koshmbi, Alabhi, Kampilya, Polasapur, Ujjayani, Mathura, Majjhimika, Simhapura, Taksashila, Vitabhayanagara and many other places, where He preached the religion of equality and self-reliance based on the blessed principles of Truth and Ahinsa to Aryans and non-Aryans alike. Even the animals turned to pay homage to the Lord of Compassion

Tributes to Mahâvîra by King Bimbisara and Others

Wherever Mahâvîra went He was received with great respect and honour. The eighteen confederate kings of Kasi and Kosala, the nine Mallakis and the nine Licchavis and others were the royal followers of Mahâvîra, who appreciated His catholic and democratic teachings.[15] The people of Anga and Magadha were equally proud to think their country was hallowed by the presence of so great a teacher and guide as Mahâvîra.[16] King Srenika Bimbisara of Magadha paid the following glowing tribute to Mahâvîra when he met him at Rajgraha:—

"You have made the best use of human birth, you have

made a true Jina... You are a Protector of Mankind at large and of your relations, for you have entered the path of the best Jinas."

—Uttaradhyayana, XX, V, 58.

Forthwith the king, together with his wives, servants, and relations, became a staunch believer in the Law with a pure mind. The places hallowed by the dust of His feet became *Tirthas* (Sacred Places) to his votaries.

The auspicious result of this preaching of Lord was very significant, as Dr. Rabindranath Tagore had remarked. He wrote that "Mahâvîra proclaimed in India, the message of salvation that religion is reality and not a mere convention; that salvation comes from taking refuge in that true religion and not from observing external ceremonies of the community; that religion cannot regard any barriers between mand and man as an eternal verity. Wonderous to say, this teaching rapidly overtopped the barriers of the race's abiding instinct and conquered the whole country."[17]

Our survey of facts establishes that Mahâvîra and the Buddha were contemporaries and both lead an ascetic life of the Great Sramanas, who proclaimed a religion of pre-Aryan type and existence. We have seen, also, that Gautama Buddha experienced the ascetic life of a Jaina shramana at a time. Hence it is not amazing, if we find many common terms and teachings between Jainism and Buddhism. Earlier Buddhism resembles Jaina belief to a great extent because Sakyamuni had studied ancient Jain scriptures [18]

Teachings of Mahâvîra

Mahâvîra taught, like the Buddha, that every living being abhors misery and is hankering for happiness., The cause of misery is ignorance of Realities of Life, which makes the individual to become inatuated with worldly desires and hankerings. The endless pursuit of desires and hankerings leads man to misery and pain. The right way to liberation from the misery of world is threefold, as comprised of *Samyaka Darshana* (Right Belief), *Samyaka Jnana* (Right Knowledge), and *Samyaka Charitra* (Right Conduct) Mahâvîra enlightened the Seeker of Truth that he should conquer the Dragon of Ignorance. For the realisation of Truth he must believe that he is something superior, excellent and everlasting physical beauty called Soul and not the

decaying body only. His Self is pure consciousnefull of infinite beautitude. It is owing to the contact of body the self has lost its divine form and has been imprisoned in the body. The law of cause and effect, as you sow so you reap, is working always to bring about a worldly condition of life : everything though is in becoming here, but it retains its eternal conscious or unconscious identity. By right belief when the man acquires the right knowledge of his soul and other substances, he gains an insight capable of seeing Truth in its every aspect. He then understands the realities of the universe and realises the importance of the seven principles, namely 1 *Jiva* (Soul), 2. *Ajiva* (non-soul), 3. *Asrava* (Influx of Karmas), 4. *Bandha* (Bondage of Karmas), 5. *Samvara* (Restraint), 6. *Nirjara* (Shedding of Karmas) and 7 *Moksa* (Emancipation) Realising the Truth of the Realities the aspirant then sets himself to observe the rules of right conduct Out of the twelve vows of a layman, the five *Silas* are essential to observe, which are 1 *Ahinsa* (Non- Injury), 2. *Satya* (Truth), 3 *Asteya* (Non-theft), 4. *Brahmacharya* (Limited celibacy) and 5. *Parigraha-parimana* (Limitation of possessions and control of desires) The observance of the threefold rules of the way of Liberation is called the "*Ratnatraya- Dharma*" of the Jainas It inspires every right-thinking man to live a true life causing least injury to his own Self and to others as well. He should accept no comfort in life at the cost of pain and misery to others. Live and let live is humane but Mahâvîra declared that it is but natural for each and every living being to help one and all in such a way that the spiritual progress, along with the material one, may be possible for all This teaching of universal love and service won the hearts of people and they realised the Truth and even today it can prove to be a panacea for all the ills humanity is suffering from

Eightfold Middle path of the Buddha & Early Buddhism

Turning to the teachings of the Buddha, we find the eightfold Middle Path almost identical to the threefold way of Liberation of Mahâvîra No doubt, the Buddha had expressed no definite opinion about soul, universe etc , but there is concrete evidence in his discourses which proves that the earlier Buddhism was quite different from that which is now being commonly

preached.[19] Take for instance, the conception of Nirvana, which is believed genreally to be the total extinction of the individual according to modern Buddhishm. But when we look into the Pali texts we find Nibbana described as the highest bliss and unsurpassed perfect security[20]. And accordingly Prof. Edward J. Thomas remarked : "It is unnecessary to discuss the view that Nirvana means the extinction of the individual, no such view has ever been supported from the texts."[21]

The Buddha had explained clearly that extinction applies only to three "flames" of lust, hate and delusion and for this reason he defined Nibbanam the gold of sainthood, as Tanha Nibbanam literally, the extinction of thirst. "The holy life with the sublime one is lived for the extinction of craving."[22] This craving can be overcome by the destruction of the *Asvas* (Asravas), which indicates that Buddha was aware of Karmic matter as the Jainas believed and he preached *Samvara* (restraint) also. Once Buddha said·—

"And I, friend by the destruction of the **Asavas** *have entered on and abide in that emancipaytion of mind, which is free from the* **Asavas,** *having realised it by mine own super knowledge even in this present life* —Samyutta-Nikaya, (II, 220)

References

1 Manjusri-mula-kalpa, slokas 381-291
2. Bhagawata-purana, 3, 5
3 Dharma-sara, Buddhistic Studies (Cal.) p 1 8
4 Mahasihanada Sutta, Majjhima 1.2 2
5 Law, Mahâvîra His Life & Teachings pp 10 12
6 The Voice of Ahimsa, Vol. I No, 6 pp 3
7 Digha Nikaya I, p 49
8 Majjhimanikaya, I, 92; Auguttarankaya, I cf Law, Mahâvîra His Life & Teachings, pp 36-51
9 *Zimmir*, Philosophies of India, p 224
10 Encyclo of Religion & Ethics, vol II p 70
11 Confluence of Opposites, p 159
12 A guide to Taxila by Sir John Marshall, pp . 88 ff and the Avasyaka-niryukti, i, 332
13 *Shah*, Studies in Jaina Art, p. 61
14 See Khandagiri & Udayagiri (Calcutta)
15 Kalpasutra p 128
16 *Law* Mahâvîra . His Life & Teachings, p 51
17 Lord Mahâvîra Commemoration Volume, p 2

18 By. Sitalaprasad Jain Buddha Tattvajnana, pt I

19 "They all agree in holding that primitive teaching must have been something different from what the earliest scriptures and commentators thought it was."

—Life of the Buddha (1927) p. 204.

Prof T W Rhys Davids and Dr Max Muller also remarked that : 'Buddhism of Pali Pitakas is not only a quite different thing from Buddhism as hitherto commonly received, but is antogonistic to it."

—Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XI, 19. Intro p 2

20 "Bliss is Nibbana"—Dhammapada "When the Karman is extinguished and there are no aggregates the Nirvana is had "

—Sutta Nipata

"With him who has left all attachment for name and form, there is no more infection to the power to death "

—Ibid 107

In "Mahavagga" we read—"Open the door of the immortaly " Asanga states a number of qualities that are not suppressed by the entry into Nirvana, such as sovereignty aisvarya of the Boddhisattva, the Parmita. If so much of Dharma remains intact in Nirvana, it can never be an absolute destruction in itself

—Prof J.C Sarkar (JBORS XVI 109)

21 Thomas, The Life of Buddha, p. 137

22 *George Grimm* "Buddhist Wisdom, the Mystry of the Self" (Munich 1911) p 57

11

MAHÂVÎRA AND THE BUDDHA*

—A. Berriedale Keith

In a very interesting article,[1] Professor Jacobi has arrived at the conclusion that, contrary to the Buddhist tradition, we must hold that Mahâvîra outlived the Buddha, probably by some seven years. In point of fact, of course, it may seem of very little consequence whether we accept this view or that of Buddhist tradition, but the issue involves a very important question affecting the value of our authorities, and on this point it seems to me clear that the position adopted by Professor Jacobi involves serious difficulties.

Professor Jacobi treats as the assured foundations for his investigations the dates of the Nirvanas of the Buddha and of Mahâvîra as 484 and 477 B.C. But it must be admitted that both these dates rest on very unsatisfactory and late evidence. The question of the date of the Buddha has been set out, with his usual acumen and precision, recently by Professor de La Vallee Poussin,[2] and he has shown how utterly uncertain is the date 483 or 484 B.C. for the Nirvana. From a very different point of view the late Professor Rhys Davids confessed[3] that the date was purely conjectural. We may readily believe that the Buddha died sometime in the fifth century B.C., but to lay any stress on the exact date is completely impossible with the evidence available. What is perfectly clear is that knowledge of the early period of Buddhism was imperfect,[4] and the same remark applies even more strikingly to the traditions of Jainism. In the case of Mahâvîra the earlier tradition—of uncertain date—is emphatic in allowing 470 years between his Nirvana and the beginning of the Vikrama era, which places the date in 528 or 527 B.C. The later tradition, given in Hemacandra's *Paricistaparvan*, viii, 339, and

* Bulletin of the School of Oriental & Afrcal Studies. 1932.

somewhat earlier in Bhadrecvara's *Kahavali*, ascribes 155 years as the period between the death of Mahâvîra and Candragupta's accession to the throne of Magadha, which gives 477 B.C. as the probable date of Mahâvîra's death. Here again we are on utterly uncertain ground.

We are obliged to treat the earlier Jain tradition as of minimal value and there seems every ground for so doing ; but the tradition accepted by Hemacandra rests equally on no assured foundation The only possible conclusion regarding it is that it cannot be trusted to be accurate within a few years, and it seems wholly impossible to base on two dates so acquired the view that we must believe that the Buddha predeceased *Mahâvîra*. Nor is it irrelevant to note that Professor Jacobi[5] himself has adopted slightly different dates, namely 477 and 467 B C. in other contributions; but what is more important is that the Jaina tradition contains one certain error which, if rectified, destroys the value of its testimony for 477 B.C By that tradition, apparently accepted by Hemacandra as well as the rest of Jain opinion, the date of the accession of Candragupta is placed at 255 years before the Vikrama era, i.e., in 313 or 312 B C This date is obviously too late; if we take 322, as does Professor Jacobi, as a probable date,[6] then we must admit a clear error in the Jain tradition of about ten years in respect of this interval, admitting a like error regarding the earlier interval, that between the accession of Candragutpa and the death of *Mahâvîra*, we would arrive at 487 B C. for the death of the latter, and this would place that event before the death of the Buddha, and confirm the Buddhist tradition This shows clearly with what inadequate data we have to reckon, and leaves the conviction that the supposed dates of the deaths of the two great teachers are of too uncertain character to afford any conclusion as to the priority of these events.

On the other hand, we have the clear and distinct tradition of the Buddhist Canon which asserts that Mahâvîra died before the Buddha and does so, not incidentally, but as giving rise to allocutions of the Master regarding the tenets of his teaching, recorded in the Pasadika Suttanta of the Digha Nikaya and the Samgana Suttanta of the Majjhima Nikaya and of Sariputta, at

the master's bidding, in the Samgiti Suttanta of the Digha Nikaya. How are we to discredit this definite tradition recorded in canonical texts ?[7] That these texts belong to the period immediately after the death of the Buddha, I confess I do not believe, but they far outrank in age the traditions of the dates of the deaths of the Buddha and Mahâvîra, and give us authentic views of the belief held in Buddhist circles at some period considerably before the Christian era. If we are to discredit their account, we must be prepared to accept the consequences, which involve acceptance of a scepticism as to the value of the Buddhist and Indian traditions in general, which is quite inconsistent with the faith placed by Professor Jacobi in the tradition as to the dates of the Nirvanas, or his acceptance of the view that the *Kautiliya Arthacastra* is the work of a minister of the Emperor Candragupta. If we are on any logical ground to discredit the Buddhist tradition, very strong arguments are necessary, and those adduced seem quite inadequate.

It is contended by Professor Jacobi that the evidence of the three Suttantas is destroyed by the fact that, while all agree in making the occasion of Mahâvîra's death and consequent unrest in his community the cause of the dissertations on the Buddhist tenets, the divergence of the form of argument in the three Suttas shows that cannot represent what the Buddha actually said. The may, of course, be conceded at once by those who believe[8] that we have little or nothing of the *ipsissima uerba* of the Master. The view which seems natural is that the Buddhists believed that there was difficuly in the Jain community on the death of their leader, and that this took place before the Buddha's death, eliciting from him comments, which were probably not preserved in any authentic form, leaving it open for the composers of the Suttantas to present the teachings each in his own way. The essential point is really the different Buddhist authors held the same tradition, which shows that it was a belief handed down by tradition an widely spread in Buddhist circles.

In the second place, Professor Jacobi argues that the account in these Suttantas is contradicted by the account in the Mahaparinibbana Suttanta, the oldest account of the proceedings of the Buddha's last year up to his Nirvana. This text does not refer to any special anxiety of the Buddha as to the fate of his

community after his death as having been elicited by the report of the dissensions in the community of Mahâvîra, whence it is deduced that this report is a later invention. But this reasoning rests on several unproved assumptions. (1) That the Mahaparinibbana Suttanta is older than the other three Suttantas is assumed without any arguments being adduced, and its age certainly is far from obvious. On the contrary, it apears to be a very sophisticated and worked up account of the last days of the Buddha, and in fact it is not open to Professor Jacobi to contend for its early date. He himself shortly afterwards (p. 562) refers to the account given in that text of the plans of Ajatacatru for the subjection of the Vrjis, and points out that the undertaking was one demanding careful planning.

He adds · "Uber die von ihm getroffenen Massnahmen enthalt das M.P.S. Angaben, die aber in viel spaterer Zeit entstanden und darum so gut wie wertlos sind " Very probably Professor Jacobi's view of the statements of the Suttanta is correct; but it is quite impossible to hold this view of it, and then to ask us to accept the silence of the Suttanta as entitling us to negate the evidence of three Suttantas, two of which at least may well be older than the Mahaparinibbana Suttanta. (2) Moreover, the argument is essentially one *ex silentio* and there is no form of contention more dangerous. It would be necessary, in order to give it weight, to show that the omission of the episode of the Buddha's views on hearing of Mahâvîra's death is inexplicable, if its occurrence were widely believed in Buddhist circles. No such proof, however, is possible. Professor Jacobi's view appears to be that the episode of the hearing of the death of Mahâvîra took place during the last journey of the Buddha *en route* to Kusinara, and that, therefore, any full account of his last days must necessarily include the episode in question. If this view were sound, there might be something to say for his contention, though the argument would be far from conclusive. But there seems no ground whatever to assume that the Buddhists thoughts that the news of Mahâvîra's death came to the Buddha just before his own Nirvana. The Samagama Suttanta has nothing to suggest such a conclusion. On the contrary the Buddha is at Samagama when he hears of the death of Mahâvîra at Pava[9] and equally in the other two Suttantas the Buddha's utterances are not connected with his

own last stay at Pava.[10] The fact that the death of Mahâvîra evokes the mention of the possibility of the effect on the order of the Buddha's death does not indicate that death was then imminent. It may be noted also that in the Upali Suttanta the Buddha was at Nalanda when the episode of the defection of Upali had so evil an effect on Mahâvîra that it brought about, according to the tradition followed by Buddhaghosa, his death at Pava. At any rate, it is clear that we have no reason to assert that Buddhist tradition placed the death of Mahâvîra close to that of the Buddha, and it is then obvious that the silence of the Mahaparinibbana Suttanta is inevitable. If the tradition placed the episode as to Mahâvîra before the short period covered by that Suttanta, it could not possibly include it in its narrative. So far, therefore, from correcting the version of the other Suttantas, the Mahaparinibbana Suttanta accords excellently with them. Nor (3) can it be admitted that the Buddha, according to tradition, shows no concern for the future of his order after his death. This runs counter to the fact, recorded in the Mahaparinibbana Suttanta itself, that he assured Ananda that the place of himself as teacher would be taken by his doctrine. This assurance is significant of the position. It accords exactly with the frame of mind asserted in the other Suttantas to have been engendered by the news of the dissensions in the Jain community on Mahâvîra's death. In the three Suttantas alike, the result of the news is to make the Buddha insist that his doctrines provided a definite system which would prevent schisms in the community. In the Mahaparinibbana the Buddha gives the same advice; his doctrine is to serve as the norm. So far, therefore, from the Mahaparinibbana contradicting the testimony of the three Suttantas, it is perfectly consistent with it, while there is no evidence whatever that it is earlier in date that the other three Suttantas, or at least two of them.

Thirdly, to strengthen his view that the Buddha could not have known of strain in the Jain community on Mahâvîra's death, Professor Jacobi insists that there is no record in the Jain tradition of such a catastrophe in the Jain community at the death of Mahâvîra as is suggested by the Buddhist tradition. No schism, it can be asserted, was occasioned by the death of Mahâvîra. Indeed sects among the Jains developed relatively late, save in the case of

the division into Svetambaras and Digambaras which was not the result of a single period of conflict The Buddhists, on the other hand, knew of schisms in their own community, arising soon after the Master's death and resulting in the development of the new religion of the Mahayana. They did not realize that Mahâvîra was not the founder of a new religion, but merely the reformer of that of Parsva, so that on Mahâvîra's death no catastrophe was possible. The Buddhist account, therefore, in the three Suttantas is based on erroneous assumptions and was evoked by dogmatic needs.

This interesting suggestion rests on a very unsound basis. It assumes that the Buddhists believed that a formal schism or a catastrophe afflicted the Jain congregation on the death of Mahâvîra But this is much more than we can justly deduce from the Buddhist statements All that is said is that there arose disputes, division, and a wordy warfare in the community and that the lay followers were disgusted with the monks. Not a suggestion is made of a real schism or catastrophe, and there seems no reason whatever to suppose that the Suttantas intended to assert that such a schism occured Moreover, it seems hard to accept the view of the paucity and lateness of schisms in the Jain community The evidence is that Mahavira was much troubled by the rivalry of Gosala, whether we regard him as strictly within the Jain community or not,[11] that in his fourteenth year of power his son-in-law, Jamali, raised opposition to him, and persisted in opposition to his death, while two years after Jamali's revolt, Tisagutta stood out in opoosition [12] Moreover, the divergence between Svetambara and Digambara is fundamental, as is fully recognized by Jains at the present day[13], so that it was certainly unnecessary for Buddhists to go to their own experience to find justification for the belief in divergence within the Jain community There is, in fact, nothing whatever to suggest that Buddhist tradition was wrong in asserting that Mahavira's death caused commotions in the Jain community. To judge from the bitter feud between Mahavira and Gosala and from the revolts of Jamali and Tisagutta, not to mention the defection of Upali, we may take it as certain that the community was far from being in ideal unity of heart. The argument that there could be no schism, because (1) Mahavira was the child of parents who were adherents of

Parsvanatha, as he perhaps also was, and (2) as a Kevalin, Mahavira was above all worldly interests, cannot be accepted. Apart from the fact that we are not told of anything so serious as a definite schism or catastrophe, it is clear that Mahavira was no mere follower of Parsvanatha. The Jain tradition does not even assert that he was an adherent, but, on the contrary, tells us distinctly that he departed in an essential from the doctrines of his predecessor, as was long ago stressed by Professor Jacobi[14] himself, who held that the innovation postulated a decline in the morality of the community between Parsva and Mahavira Moreover, even if, as a Kevalin, Mahavira was superior to worldly considerations, what has that to do with the effect of his death on the community ? The disapperance of a great teacher is always a time of trial for his adherents, and, so far from doubting the truth of the assertions of the Buddhist texts, we may treat them as representing the normal result as in the case of Purana Kassapa, and common sense invites us to believe that what is normal really happens.

Still less satisfactory is the explanation offered by Professor Jacobi of the cause of the alieged Buddhist error. The Buddhists, he holds, confused the place of Mahâvîra's death, which is now identified with a village, Papapuri (Pavapuri) in the Bihar part of the Patna district, with the town[15] Pava in which the Buddha stayed in the house of Cunda on the way to Kusinara. The correctness of the Jain identification, Professor Jacobi holds, cannot be doubted. This seems a strange assertion, for he holds that the three Suttantas fall in the second or third century after the Nirvana of the Buddha, and he does not give any indication of the age of the Jain identification.[16] To assert an error on the part of the Buddhists demands support by adduction of proof of the early date of the Jain view, which appears to be lacking and, at any rate, is urgently required But, apart from this minor consideration, what ground is there for holding that a mistake as to a place was sufficient to cause the invention of an assertion of the death of Mahâvîra in the lifetime of the Buddha ? It is perfectly legitimate to suppose that the Buddhists were right in placing the death of the rival teacher before that of Buddha, even if they confused the two places. But that they were wrong in their identification is so far quite unproved, through possible.

It must be added that the tradition that the Buddha died after Mahâvîra, thus asserted with particularity in the Buddhist texts, recorded within two or three centuries after his death, according to Professor Jacobi's own dating, is not contradicted by anything expressed in the Jain tradition and that the contradiction rests on the strength of a deduction from two late and unsatisfactory traditions fixing the date of the deaths of the two teachers. If the Jain tradition contradicted the Buddhist by asserting that Mahâvîra died after the Buddha, the case for Professor Jacobi's view would assume a different aspect; but, though the Jains must for many centuries have been aware of the Buddhist assertion, there has been adduced no passage in which they negatived it. The obvious conclusion is that no doubt existed in either community on this point.

Professor Jacobi has endeavoured on the basis of the Jain and Buddhist traditions to throw some light on the political development of Magadha in the time of the great teachers, but it may seriously be doubted if we can make anything very satisfactory out of these confused and obviously biased records. There is no independent control available, and combinations thus become subjective to the highest degree. But one point with which he deals elsewhere[17] should be noted, his belief that Parsva can be assigned confidently to a period 250 years before Mahâvîra, a view which is utilized by him as assigning to the early part of the eighth century B.C. that influence of popular religious belief on Indian philosophy, which led to the innovations of the Yoga and Samkhya systems, involving (1) belief in the personal immortality of souls, and (2) the recognition of moral principles, and thus advancing beyond the monistic tendency of the older Upanisads with their intellectual disdain for morals. We really cannot accept, as in any sense valid, the date assigned to Parsvanatha. If Jain tradition was wrong, as Professor Jacobi holds it was, in dating the Nirvana of Mahâvîra, how can we trust its assertions for a period 250 years earlier ? The mere figure is suspicious, and why should we give it any greater credence than we do to the figures equally afforded by tradition[18] for the number of his adherents ? All that we can possibly rescue from the tradition is the belief in the existence of Parsva at some time

before Mahâvîra; to claim more is misleading. There are other objections to certain features of Professor Jacobi's most interesting reconstructing of the early Yoga, but these must be dealt with on another occasion.[19]

References

1 *SBA*. 1930, pp 557-68
2. *Indo-europeens et Indo-iraniens*, pp 238-48, *L' Inde aux Temps des Mauryas*, P. 50.
3 *CHI* ı, pp 171, 172
4 Keith, *Buddhist Philosophy*, chap ı
5 Introduction to *Kalpa Sutra*, p 9· Introduction to *Paricistaparvan*, p 6
6 In *CHI*, i pp 471-3, 321 ıs suggested as plausıble. For other dates see L de La Vallee Poussın, *L'Inde aux Temps des Mauryas*, pp 51, 52.
7 The Upali Suttanta clearly asserts an ıllness, ıf not the death, of Mahâvîra , Chalmers, *SBB* v p 278, n 2
8 See Wınternıtz, *Geschichte der Indıschen Litteratur*, ıı p 360. f
9 Cunda here appears as a novie, and so also in the Pasadika Suttanta, whıch marks hım out from his descrıptıon ın the Mahaparınibbana Suttanta The Samgıti Suttanta does not use thıs term of hım, and seems to have been influenced by the Mahaparınıbbana ın thıs poınt , compare Franks, *Digha Nıkaya*, p 229 Two Cundas can hardly be admitted, though the Mahaparınıbbana is certaınly confused.
10 The Samgıtı sets the scene ın Pava, but under quıte other cırcumstances than those of the Mahaparınibbana, namely the consecration of the new Mote-Hall of the Mallas Thıs ındicates that the author had no desıre to connect the episode recorded wıth the death of the Buddha also The location at Samagama seems the more accurate account The fact that Cunda of Pava brought the news to Ananda no doubt encouraged the ıdea that the declaratıon of vıews took place at that town.
11 Hoernle, *ERE*, ı pp 267 ff , held that the Jain dıvısıon ınto Dıgambara and Svetambara may be trac^d back to the begınning of Jaınısm, beıng due to the antagonısm of Mahâvira and Gosala, the representatıves of two hostıle sects
12 See Chımanlal J Shah, *Jainism ın Northern India*, pp. 60-5
13 Chımanlal J Shah, op cit , p 78
14. *IA*. ix, p. 160
15 Jacobı (p 561) ascrıbes Pava to the Sakyas, but ıt ıs clear that ıt was a Malla town
16 The *Kalpa Sutra* ascrıbed to Bhadrabahu is clearly not by that author, and ıs wholly uncertain in date see Winternıtz. *Geschichte der Indıschen Litterature*, ıı, pp 309 f.
17 *SBA* 1930, pp 326, 327
18 See *Kalpa Sutra*, sectıons 161-4.
19 It ıs dubıous if the *Bhagavati*, vıı, 9, 2, can be understood, as by Professor Jacobi (p 564) as meaning that the Mallakıs and Licchavıs were the chıefs of the Kasıs and Kosalas

12

JAMALI : HIS LIFE AND POINT OF DIFFERENCE FROM LORD MAHÂVÎRA*

—*Prithviraj Jain*

1. Sources

The particulars about the life of Jamali, who was responsible for causing the first schism in the history of Jaina Church, are recounted mainly in the *Vyakhyaprajnapti*[1] or the Bhagavati Sutra, the fifth[2] *Anga* of the Jaina canon. The frequent references to his name are found in other scriptures as well where the description of certain events are almost identical with those of Jamali as narrated in the Bhagavati. Such references, firstly, point out the process[3] through which a particular person comes to know about the arrival of a Tirthankara or an Acarya in his home-town or a place nearby and gets ready for a visit in order to pay obeisance to him and after hearing the religious discourse resolves to enter the ascetic order on obtaining the consent of his parents Secondly, they describe the order of grand procession,[4] which is piloted through the principal streets and bazaars of the city with great eclat and show, on the auspicious occasion of one's renunciation According to the *Sthanaiga Sutra*[5], the *Antakrddas*, the eighth *Anga* of the canon contained as its sixth chapter "The Chapter on Jamali", but unfortunately that is not extant Exegetical literature on some scriptures, i e, the *Sthananga*, the *Uttaradhyayana* and the *Avasyaka*, etc., also provides information about Jamali.

It is remarkable that all references in regard to Jamali are narrated only in Svetambara literature The scriptures accepted

* Acharya Vijayavallabhasuri Communoration volume, 1956

by the Digambara sect of Jainas have not mentioned his name anywhere. It was a natural corollary that the Digambara Acaryas could not refer to him as nephew or son-in-law of Lord Mahâvîra; they did not believe that Mahâvîra had a sister or that he ever married. What an impartial student of Jaina literature fails to explain is that the name of Jamali is not mentioned by the Digambara Acaryas even as one of the disciples and fellow-workers of Mahâvîra who ended by opposing him.

2. Birth-place, parents and family circumstances

According to the *Bhagavati*, *Jamali* was an aristocratic and supremely gifted prince of Ksatriya-kundagrama, home-town of Lord Mahâvîra, situtated in the western direction of Brahmana-kundagrama. These towns lay not very far off from each other and were separated by Bahusala-caitya, which stood midway. Scholars differ in regard to the exact location of these towns and their proximity to Vaisali. It seems that they were either suburbs of Vaisali or were situated near this famous historical city, the capital of Videha.[6]

Strangely the *Bhagavati* does not furnish any information regarding the names of Jamali's parents, though it is they who took him to Mahâvîra and requested the Lord to initiate him into his fold, when they found that Jamali was very keen on executing his resolve of renouncing the worldly life. According to a commentary[7] on the *Kalpasutra*, Jamali was the son of 'Pravara-narapati' There is a belief[8] that Jamali had the privilege of being the nephew (sister's son) of Lord Mahâvîra. Now Mahâvîra had only one sister (of course, elder) named Sudarsana [9] Hence it can be concluded that she was the mother of Jamali.

Jamali's father was a person of great opulence and influence, who enjoyed deferential esteem and courteous regard from all quarters. One thousand healthy and handsome young men, all belonging to his family, offered their services at his command to carry the palanquin in which Jamali went to become the disciple of Lord Mahâvîra. He threw open his vast treasures on this auspicious occasion. The barber was rewarded with one lac of golden coins Two lacs coins of gold were paid for a rajoharana[10] and a mendicant's wooden bowl

3. Early life and marriage

Born in a rich family and being the only son of his parents, Jamali had all chances and facilities for leading a luxurious life in a gay and jovial manner. The account in the *Bhagavati* evidently shows that he was blissfully ignorant of the vicissitudes of worldly life outside his lofty mansions. It is said that he used to keep himself steeped in mirth and joy day and night. His methods of enjoyment varied from season to season. He took keen delight in thirty-two kinds of dramatic representations to the accompaniment of music and dances performed by beautiful women Thus there appears to have been nothing extra-ordinary in his early career except that he was a rich, healthy, influential and clever prince, who was brought up in affluence and luxury.

Relying on purely cononical evidence, the marriage of Jamali to the daughter of Mahâvîra seems to be of somewhat dubious character. It is obvious from the *Bhagavati* that he had eight wives. All of them were young girls, born of noble families, refined, elegant, graceful and having practically indentical complexion, age, apperance and beauty. But as regards their names and parentage, the account of the *Bhagavati* is silent There is not even a slight hint in this or any other canon, which may justify the general belief that Jamali was the son-in-law of Mahâvîra. On the other hand, exegeticall literatuie depicting Jamali as nephew and son-in-law of Mahâvîra does not confirm the view of the *Bhagavati* that he had more than one wife.

The Agamic account concerning Jamali's life is neither in accord nor in discord with the current belief which represents him as nephew and son-in-law of Mahâvîra The commentators of the *Kalpasutra,*[11] the *Sthananga*[12], the *Uttaradhyayana*[13], the *Visesavasyaka*[14] etc., are unanimous in regarding him as closely related to Mahâvîra There is some confusion as regards the names of Mahavira's sister and daughter The Acaranga (400) and the *Kalpasutra* (109) name his sister as Sudarsana and daughter as Anavadyangi or Priyadarsana. But in commentaries, we find the names Anavadyangi or Jyestha or even Sudarsana.

Now the question arises how far we should regard the popular belief regarding worldly relation of Mahâvîra and Jamali as authentic in the absence of any definite canonical evidence.

The commentators rely on an old tradition (वृद्धसंप्रदायात्, कथानकात्). It is difficult to find out the source of this tradition. But one thing is obvious. If we accept the list of names of Mahâvîra's relatives as given in the *Kalpasutra* and *Acaranga* to be reliable, we should admit the accuracy of this tradition. This list bears testimony to the fact that Mahâvîra was married, he had a daughter and a grand-daughter (daughter's daughter) who was named Sesavati or Yasovati. Thus there is nothing to contradict that Priyadarsana was married to Jamali. The absence of any allusion in respect of this notable event in the canon seems to be a merely accidental one.

4. The hearing of Lord's sermon

Jamali was leading a life of ease and pleasure, when one day he heard a great commotion from his elevated palace. Curiosity arose in his mind. At once, he called his chamberlain (Kancukin) and asked him to inquire into the matter. The chamberlain acquainted him with the actual state of the scene. The Venerable Omniscient Lord Mahâvîra was staying in Bahusala caitya of Brahmana- kundagrama. The people of different status and varying ages were rushing to that place to pay their respects to the Lord and hear his discourse.

Jamali lost no time to make up his mind to visit the holy place. Having executed the formalities and preparations suitable for the occasion, Jamali, accompanied by his friends and relatives, started towards the Bahusala caitya passing through the main roads of his town. Arriving at the spot, he solemnly circumambulated the Lord three times from the left to the right and bowing down saluted him.

He was profoundly impressed by the serenity and majesty of the Lord's appearance. He heard the discourse patiently and felt an intuition that there was a true solution of the knotty problem of life. The sermon moved him deeply. He realized that it was time for him to renounce the worldly life. After the dispersal of the congregation, Jamali approached the venerable Lord and manifested to him his desire to become a monk in the following words :—

'Revered Sir, I have verily the faith in the preachings of *Nirgranthas* (outwardly and inwardly unfettered), I trust those

preachings, I like them and am prepared to mould my life according to them. They are indeed so as you have explained them. They are true, correct and devoid of all doubts. I have only to take permission of my parents. After that I shall become the initiated disciple of you, the Venerable Lord and be a wandering monk instead of a house- holder.'

The Lord replied, 'Do not interrupt it, if it please you, O Beloved of gods.'

5. Entering the order of Jaina Asceticism

Jamali returned home with his thoughts definitely crystallized to the renunciation of worldly ties as the world seemed to him essentially a vale of misery. He greeted his parents and said, "I heard the religious discourse from Lord Mahâvîra. I am moved by it. Hence, my dear mother and father, I feel depressed with the miseries of earthly life. I am afraid of birth, old age and death. Therefore, I desire, with your kind permission to renounce household life and enter the ascetic one being properly initiated by Lord Mahâvîra."[15]

No sooner had his mother heard these words, than she fainted. It was with great effort on the part of Jamali and her attendants that she regained consciousness. A long discussion then followed between Jamali and his parents. They tried in vain to persuade their beloved and only son to desist from adopting the course of a houseless monk. They reminded him of his extreme and vigorous youth, riches, beautiful wives and all the means of worldly enjoyments, which were ever at his command. But a firm resolution could not be altered He told his parents the fleeting and transitory nature of earhtly goods. He explained to them his total abhorrence of worldly pleasures and their non-finality. His parents, then, tried to discourage Jamali from his resolve by the intolerable hardships and severe sufferings one has to meet in course of a mendicant's life. Even then, he was unmoved in his rocklike decision. He said that he was in search of undying bliss and wanted to escape from the never ending cycle of births and deaths with all their concomitant experiences. Hence the privations of an ascetic life would not dissuade him from following the path he had chosen. The parents realized that they

could not prevail upon Jamali to lead the life of householder. At last they yielded and gave their consent with great reluctance.

The preparations were made on a grand scale for Jamali's renunciation. The usual formalities were performed and Jamali was taken to Lord Mahâvîra. His parents bowed and saluted the Lord and said thus : 'In this manner, Sir, the Ksatriya prince Jamali is verily our only son, beloved and charming. Whose mere name is scarce to be heard, how difficult is it to have a sight of him ? Just as a lotus or a water lily sprouts in the mud, grows in the water but remains perfectly unsoiled with mud-dust or water-drops, in a similar manner, this Ksatriya prince Jamali is born and has been brought up in pleasures and sensual enjoyments. Even then, they have no power over him. Nor have friends, kinsmen and near and dear relatives any attraction for him. O You Beloved of gods, He is averse to these worldly objects and afraid of the pains of birth and death. He wishes, after having got himself shaved bald to get himself initiated before you. Therefore, we offer you this gift of him. Please accept, Beloved of gods, the gift of a disciple.'

The formal ceremonies were performed and Jamali, together with five hundred young men, all in the heyday of their youth, entered the Holy Order. Muni Kalyana Vijaya holds the view that the initiation of Jamali took place, during the second year of Mahâvîra's attainment of Infinite Knowledge, i.e., Omniscience (499-498 B.V.)[16]

6. Ascetic Life

That was a time when asceticism was essentially combined with profound scholarship. The first and foremost duty of a young neophyte was as usual, to study the eleven Angas. Naturally Jamali was instructed in these holy scriptures. In due course he attained a position of distinction and influence. Mahâvîra then made him head of 500 monks and 1000 nuns who were under the supervision of Priyadarsana, Jamali's wife in worldly relations who also accepted the life of a female ascetic when her husband had renounced the world. It seems that the high rank held by Jamali was not on account of his exceptional learning but due to his influence on his fellow monks, who had a great regard for him during his household life. The statement that he studied the

eleven holy scriptures appears to be a tentative one because he could not claim mastery over them as will be evident from the questions put to him when he was bent on being regarded as Kevalin.

For about ten years he remained with Lord Mahâvîra. Definite account of his activities during this long period is available. The analysis of subsequent events confirms that he must have struggled hard to gain a high position among the Mahâvîra's ascetics and even aspired to obtain the coveted rank of a Kevalin.

So far as the observation of rigid rules of ascetic life is concerned he followed a course of extreme self-discipline. From the very start he practised a rigorous form of austerity and used to fast until the fourth or sixth or eighth meal and onward, i.e. for one day or two days or three days and even more Some times he gave up all food for a fortnight or even a month. Thus he wandered mortifying himself with peculiar penances and constraints. The excellence of his self-restraint and purity of conduct was made known to Gautama by Mahâvîra after Jamali's death Gautama asked the Lord.[17] "Sir, did the houseless monk Jamali take flavourless, tasteless, left-over, coarse, rough and inferior food ? Did he live on such meals ? Was he a man who had subdued his passions, lived peacefully and led a solitary as well as holy life ?" "Yes, Gautama", was the reply.

7. Severance of Jamali from Mahâvîra

One day during the 12th year[18] i.e. 489-488 B.V. of Mahâvîra's life as Kevalin, Jamali approached the Lord and having praised him thus said, "I intend, Sir, being permitted by you to wander over various villages and towns together with five hundred monks" On hearing this request, Lord Mahâvîra remained perfectly silent.[19] The request was repeated for the second and even third time but it failed to bring out any tangible result. The commentator Abhaya Deva Suri[20] assumes that Mahâvîra's silence on the request was due to his indifference to the proposal as it contained in itself the seeds of future disruption.

Then Jamali, probably taking this silence as a form of approval.[21] bowed down, saluted the Lord, left the Bahusala caitya and began to tour independently along with 500 ascetics.

After wandering from village to village for about a period of three years, he arrived on a certain day at a town Sravasti by name, and resorted to Kosthaka sanctuary of that place. It is here that an event, which proved to be a turning-point in his life took place. During his stay one day he took very tasteless, inferior, rough, stale and musty food which was brought after the time to taking meal was over, and was taken regardless of the quantity thereof. This resulted in his falling ill seriously. The disease took an acute form in no time and he felt that his whole body was burning due to bilious fever. He called his fellow monks and asked them to spread a bedding for him. They faithfully obeyed the order and engaged themselves with the work so that he might have a complete rest. But it could not be carried on expeditiously as he had wished and the severity of pain was increasing every moment. He called them again and said, "Has the bed been spread or is it being spread ?"[22] They replied,[23] "O beloved of gods, it is not spread yet, but is being spread.[24] Now doubt crept in Jamali's mind He said to himself, "Lord Mahâvîra has said and explained[25] thus : what is moving is called 'moved, what is rising or maturing is known 'risen' or 'matured', what is partially destroyed is said to be 'partially destoryed', etc. This statement is false. It is obviously seen that so long as the bedding is being spread, it is not spoken of as spread. Hence how can the above doctrine of Lord Mahâvîra be said to be held true ?" Then he gathered together other monks and proclaimed the falsity of Mahâvîra's preaching Some of them expressed their faith in his conclusions, while others disliked it, and left his company and joined Lord Mahâvîra, who was at Purnabhadra sanctuary of Campa City.

After some time, when Jamali was completely cured of the disease, he also left Sravasti and wandering from village to village reached Campa. He kept himself standing neither near nor far from the Lord and spoke thus, "I do not abide like 'Chadmastha' (a person possessing imperfect knowledge i.e. who has not gained omniscience) as many of your 'Chadmastha' houseless disciples do. I do tourings like an 'Arhat' or 'Jina' or 'Kevalin' who has attained infinite knowledge and infinite intuition." It shows that Jamali, in emulation of other Kevalins, had an ambition to be

venerated as Kevalin. But for lack of ability and profound scholarship, his ambition could not be fulfilled. On his bold assertion, Gautama said to him, "If you regard yourself as Kevalin, please answer two questions : (i) Is the world eternal or non-eternal ? (ii) Is the soul eternal or non-eternal ?" Jamali was perplexed and could not reply. Mahâvîra said to him, "O Jamali, many of my monk-disciples are in a state of 'Chadmastha'. Even then, like me, they are capable of answering these questions. But they do not speak in the terms you have just spoken i.e. I am 'Jina' or 'Kevalin'." Mahavira, then, explained to Jamali the nature of the world and the soul in answer to these questions Thus, it was known that many other monks in the Holy Order were more advanced in their studies and knowledge than Jamali.

Jamali listened to Mahâvîra but could not repose faith in him. He left again, leading the life of an ascetic for a number of years. He misled himself and others by expounding a false doctrine under the influence of wrong belief. But he failed totally to gather followers and all his fellow-monks deserted him. Observing a fortnight's 'fast unto death' ('samlekhana), he emanciated his body and died without expiating his sins Then, he was born in Lantaka heaven as a 'Low inferior god' (Kilbisika god).[26]

After his death, Gautama asked Lord Mahâvîra some questions regarding Jamali and the Kilbisika gods. One of the questions was . 'Where would Jamali be born after completing his duration of life as a god in the heaven ?' The Lord said, 'O Gautama, having wandered for four or five cycles of births and deaths in sub-human, human, heavenly and hellish lives, he would become 'Emancipated' and thus end all misery.'

The commentators on the *Bhagavati raise an interesting questions*[27] and try to answer it. 'Why was he (Jamali) initiated by Lord Mahâvîra, who knew before hand the future events as he was in possession of infinite knowledge ?' In answer to this question, they state that even great persons are probably unable to turn the course of events, which are destined to take place. Or, the Lord regarded it, i e., initiation of Jamali, advantageous in a way The Venerable Tirthankaras never engage in frivolous activities.

8. The significance of the controversy between Mahâvîra & Jamali

According to the Bhagavati, having bid farewell for ever to Lord Mahâvîra, Jamali preached many wrong tenets on account of his wrong faith. However, we do not come across any other adverse view except one state before. The one and only controversial point between them as related in the canons was the Mahâvîra believed in the theory of 'कडेमाणे कडे' while Jamali pinned his faith in 'कडे कडे'. Naturally, one may ask why did a unique personality like Lord Mahâvîra, regarded omniscient, patient, a man of unequalled calm and of a quiet nature, the foremost expounder of the doctrine of Non-Absolution, oppose Jamali on such an apparently insignificant matter and thus allow the monastic order to be split into two, may be for a short period only ? Did it not behove Mahâvîra to ignore the opposition of Jamali and let him go his own way ? Or, did the Lord consider Jamali's view detrimental to the holy order and the common people ? Can the outstanding difference between them be cemented ? These problems have been elaborately dealt with by the renowned scholar Pt. Sukhllaji, in one of his articles[28] and we may briefly note here his views on these points.

Lord Mahâvîra judged every thing from a Non-Absolutistic view He said that the knowledge of an object remained incomplete or imperfect unless it was gained from various standpoints relative to one another. This principle should be aplied to metaphysical or philosophical theories as well as to the everyday problems one has to face in life. Broadly we can divide the various standpoints about a particular thing into two-emprical or practical, transcendental or real. The former is based on direct experience while the latter on indirect one. The former contains variety of experience and the latter has unity of experience. The empirical standpoint takes into account the distinction lying betwen ends and means but the transcendental one makes no such distinction. Before we proceed to form our opinion about any principle or action, we must keep in mind both of these standpoints. The process of understanding the true nature of an object or an activity is possible only if we follow the practical

without ignoring even for a moment the real. This is the background which made Mahâvîra oppose Jamali.

Mahâvîra knew well that human nature in general lacks patience and perseverance. Every individual has a keen desire to have speedy and maximum result with the minimum of labour. It is not also unoften that a man is just near the point of enjoying the fruit of his labour when all of a sudden he comes across an obstacle or difficulty and being disappointed gives up the undertaking. He attributes the responsibility of his failure to extreme causes without having any idea of his own drawbacks like impatience and lack of sufficient effort, needed for the purpose. Many social and political activities remain only half-done owing to this significant fact about human nature.

Having in view the above datum, Mahâvîra proclaimed that an action whose process has been set on roll can be said to have been done from one standpoint When our effort continues, it goes on achieving its end to the proportion in which it stands as accomplished. The result in view as a whole is attainable at the end of a long and continuous effort. But the amount of labour put in during the whole process cannot be regarded in vain as each and every part of that labour had its own role to play and the final result is nothing but the sum total of all those individual parts. If this fundamental truth is ignored no attempt either in spiritual matters or in worldly dealings can be carried on efficiently and steadily. Mahâvîra's doctrine inspires a man to proceed on his way and not to regard the utter futility of his effort or activity however slight it may be in quantity.[29] It promises him fruition of his undertaking at every step. It discourages him from running away from the responsibility thinking that the obstructions or along period of time would defeat his purpose and not allow him to taste the sweet fruit of his arduous labour. He feels satisfaction at every moment during the performance of a particular action that he has been crowned with success so far

That is why the Lord preached the doctrine of 'कडेमाणे कडे'. It means that an action which is still going on or is not completed yet or whose final result seems to be far off, can be said to have been done or completed or to have attained its objective. It does not recognize any difference between the act and its result. The

result or fruit is not same thing which is quite apart from the effort and is gained at the last moment of it but the whole series of an action from the commencement to the end is its fruit. Jamali on the other hand held the theory of 'कडे कडे'. He meant thereby that the activity which is still going on cannot in any respect be said to have been completed unless its final result becomes obvious. The effort and the result are not identical but are altogether different. The long process of an effort as a whole is a means to an end which is attainable only at the last moment.

It can be seen that Mahâvîra could reconcile Jamali's view from a practical point of view. But Jamali refused to accept the transcendental standpoint underlying Mahâvîra's preaching and emphasised only the practical one. Deeper speculation and greater insight shows that Mahâvîra was justified in disowning Jamali's absolute stand on the point as it was unfit for, perhaps even dangerous to, ordinary human minds who were apt to meet failures in their lives had they put their faith in Jamali's propaganda.

9. Ultimate Fate of Bahuratavada

Jamali and his followers called Bahuratah (आवश्यकनिर्युक्ति 779; उत्तरा० नि० 165) The reason for this is that they believed that an object which happens to be produced takes a long time before it is completed. According to them a thing is not produced the very first moment to which the activity is attributed, but it requires many moments for its completion and production.

Jamali failed to attract any adherents to his new school and in the long run he was the solitary votary of his doctirne. But in the beginning many a monk put his trust in him. Particularly Sudarsana or Priyadarsana, Jamali's wife and Mahâvîra's daughter in worldly relations, with her one thousand nuns could not keep apart from him and even used to induce others to adhere to the teachings of Jamali.

At the time of the rift she was staying at the house of the Jaina layman Dhanka, a potter by caste. She tried to convince him of the significance of Bahuratavada. But he was a man of firm conviction. He hit upon a plan to reconvert the dissenters to the True Path.

One day she was engaged in her usual studies and Dhanka was busy with his professional work. Suddenly he took a burning coal from his kiln and threw it upon her upper garment with the result that a small portion of it caught fire. She at once said, "O layman votary ! You have burnt my upper garment." (*Visesavasyaka Bhasya* 2324). He gave a quick reply, "The proposition, what is burning is burnt, is against your doctrine."

A minor discussion followed but the dialectics of Dhanka had the desirable effect upon her and others who were still under the influence of Jamali. All of them uttered with one voice, "Oh noble man, we intend to follow your exhortation which is full of truth." Then they headed by Dhanka came to the Lord and rejoined him. Thus Jamali was left all alone and died without any follower.

The Jaina philosophical school remained intact.

References

1 *Sataka* 9, *Uddesaka* 33
2 *Nandisutra* 44
3 a *Anuttaraupapatikadasa section* 3, Story of Dhanna
b *Nirayavali section* 5, Chapter 1, Story of Prince Viranga
4 *Jnatadharmakatha part* 1, Chapter 8, Story of Malli Kumari
5 Sutra 755
6 'Vaisali', pp 20 to 26 (by Vijayendrasuri)
7 '*Subodhika*', p. 89 A (by Vinayavijaya)
8 a *Kalpalata* commentary on *Kalpasutra* p 121 A (Samayasundra)
b *Sthanangavrtti*, p 389 B
9 a *Kalpasutra*, 109 b *Acaranga* 400.
10 A cloth to wipe off dust, which is kept by Jaina monks as a symbolic accessory
11 *Kalpalata* p 121A तया सह सुखमनुभवतो भगवतः प्रियदर्शनानाम्नी पुत्री जाता। सा निजाभिनेयस्य जमालेः परिणायिता। p 121B भगवतो भगिनी सुदर्शना जमालेः माता।
12 Sthanangavrtti p 389 B तत्र जमालिः क्षत्रियकुमारो, यो हि श्रमणस्य भगवतो महावीरस्य भागिनेयो भगवद्दुहितुः सुदर्शनाभिधानाया भर्ता।
13 commentary by Santyacarya p 15 तत्र स्वामिनो ज्येष्ठा भगिनी सुदर्शना नाम, तस्याः पुत्रो जमालिः, स स्वामिनो मूले प्रव्रजितः पञ्चभिशतैः सम तस्य च भार्या स्वामिनो दुहिताऽनवद्याङ्गी नाम्नी द्वितीयं नाम प्रियदर्शना।
14 बृहद्वृत्तिः (मलधारी हेमचंद्र) p 935 तत्र भगवतः श्रीमहावीरस्य भागिनेयो जमालिर्नाम राजपुत्र आसीत्। तस्य च भार्या श्रीमन्महावीरस्य दुहिता। तस्याश्च ज्येष्ठेति वा, सुदर्शनेति वा अनवद्याङ्गीति वा नामेति।
15 ''समणस्स भगवस्स महावीरस्स अंतिए धम्मे निसंते जाव अभिरुइए तह णं अहं अम्म-ताओ। संसार भयउव्विग्गे भीते जम्मजरामरणेण तं इच्छामि णं अम्म-ताओ। तुब्भेहिं अब्भणुन्नाए समाणे समणस्स भगवओ महावीरस्स अंतिय मुंडे भवित्ता अगाराओ अणगारियं पव्वइत्तए।''
16 Sramana bhagavan Mahâvîra, p 79
17 ''जमाली णं भंते ! अणगारे, अरसाहारे, विरसाहारे, अंताहारे, पंताहारे, लूहाहारे, तुच्छाहरे, अरसजीवी, विरसजीवी, जाव तुच्छजीवी उवसंतजीवी, पसंतजीवी, विवित्तजीवी ? ''हंता गोयमा !''

18. Sraman Bhagavan Mahâvira p. 119

19. तह णं से समणे भगवं महावीरे जमालिस्स अणगारस्स एयमट्ठं णो आढाइ णोपरिजाणाइ तुसिणीए संचिट्ठइ।

20 'भाविदोषत्वनोपेक्षणीयत्वात्तस्य इति' अभयदेवीयावृत्तिः भगवतीसूत्र p' 893

21 Malayagiri in his commentary on Avasyaka (p. 402) says that Jamali took permission of Mahâvira Santyacarya's commentary on उत्तराध्ययन (p 153B) gives a similar account.

22. सेज्जा संथारए णं किं कडे कज्जइ ?

23 णो खलु देवाणुप्पियाणं सेज्जासंथारे कडे, कज्जइ !

24 According to Santyacarya (p 153B) reply was negative one as it is found in the Bhagavati But Acarya Malayagiri (commentary on Avasyaka, p 402B) Abhayadeva (Sthanangavrtti, p. 390) and Maladhari Hemacandra (Visesavasyaka Vrtti, p 936) hold that the monks replied that the bed was stretched although it was as yet being stretched or was only half-stretched

25 Bhagavati 1 1

26 ''किल्विषिका अतस्थस्थानीया :'' तत्त्वार्थभाष्य 4 4 Haribhadra says in his commentary in this Bhasya ''अन्तस्था: चण्डालादय:''

27 अथ श्रीवीरेण सर्वज्ञात्वादमुं तद्व्यतिकर जानतापि किमित्यसौ प्रव्राजित: ? उच्यते अवश्यंभाविभावाना महानुभावैरपि प्रायोल्लंघयितुशक्यत्वाद् इत्यमेव वा गुणविशेषदर्शनात् भगवतोऽर्हन्तो न निष्प्रयोजनं क्रियासु प्रवर्तन्ते इति। *Bhagavati-sutra-vrtti* by Danasekhara Suri p 164 A

28 "Jain Yuga" Vol I. No 8

29 नेहाभिक्रमनाशोऽस्ति प्रत्यवायो न विद्यते। स्वल्पमप्यस्य धर्मस्य त्रायते महतो भयात्/।। The Bhagavatgita II 40 "In this path, no effort is ever lost and no obstacle prevails , even a little of this righteousness saves from geat fear" Sir S Radhakrishnan explains it in the following words —"No step is lost, every moment is a gain Every effort in the struggle will be counted as a merit" p 116

13

BUDDHA & MAHÂVÎRA*

—Pandit SukhlalJi

Principal Sramana Cults

The cult opposed to the religious cult known as the Brahmanic or Vedic cult is Sramana cult. It positively existed in India in some part of other in some form or other just along with the spread of the Vedic cult. The branches and sub-branches of the Sramana cult were so many and of these the names of Samkhya, Jaina, Buddha and Ajiyava are famous. In the beginning many of these were diametrically opposed to the Vedic cult, but in due course they merged in the Vedic cult due to one reason or another. To illustrate, we can give the names of the Vaisnava and Saiva cults. Ancient Vaisnava and Saiva Agamas were not only different from the vedic tradition, they even opposed it That is the reason why the Acaryas who uphelp the Vedic ult, looked upon the ancient Vaisnava and Saiva Agamas as opposed to the Vedas and therefore outside the pale of the Vedas. To-day, however, we can see that the Vaisnava and Saiva traditions and their branches, have merged completely in the vedic cult, and are taken as vedic. In spite of this, there are some Sramana cults that call themselves non-Vedic; even scholars of the Vedas know them to be so. The dominant ones here are the Jaina and Buddha.

A general and brief acquaintance of the Sramana cult is this It does not accept the supreme authority of the Vedas as not composed by any human being or eternal of composed by god. It does not accept the supremacy of the brahmin class because it acts as Purohita The Vedic cult accepts this authority of the Vedas and brahmins in the present context. All the Sramana traditions

* "Essence of Jainism"
L.D. Institute of Indology, 1988, Ahmedabad

take the best and noblest personality in their cult as the promulgator and take his words as the final authority. They prefer virtues to the race as higher and nobler and accept only the Samnyasi or the recluse as the preceptor.

Nirgrantha Cult is Jainism : Some Proofs

In the ancient times, in most of the Sramana traditions, the words used generally for the preceptor or the recluse wre these- Sramana, Bhiksu, Anagara, Yati, Sadhu, Tapasvi, Parivarjaka, Arthanta, Jina, Tirthankara etc. The Jain cult, like the Bauddha and Ajivaka, also uses these very wrods for its preceptors. But there is one word which the Jain cult and only the Jain cult has used right from the beginning in its history for its preceptor. The word is Nirgrantha (Prakrit Nigganthа-Acaranga 1.2, 1.108) according to Jain Agamas; Nirgrantha is 'Nigganthа' according to the Bauddha Pitakas. We can state even to this extent that in no tradition except the Jaina has the word 'Nirgrantha' become prominent or conventional. That is the reason why the Jaina scriptures are known as 'Nigganthapayavana', i.e. 'Nirgranthapravacana' In no other cult is this word used for the scriptures

The relation that persists between the Nirgrantha cult as stated in the Agamas with the Bauddha Pitakas is not to be found with the Vedic or Pauranika traditions. These are its reasons:

(i) The Jain and Bauddha cults being Sramana cults, there is a fraternal relation between the two.

(ii) The founder of the Baudhha cult and the last propagator of the Nirgrantha cult Lord Mahâvîra, were contemporaries. Again, they passed their lives in the same or similar sphere. Their sphere of activity was, not only one region but one city, one street and just one family. The followers of both were used to meeting each other now and again and used to discuss, in a friendly or challenging manner, the preachings and conduct of their respected preceptors There were so many followers who changed their loyalty from one cult to the other. This happened as if the followers of Buddha and Mahâvîra were very close neighbours or family members. It should be conceded that this happened as if so many members of the same family held different beliefs as it is seen even today

(iii) Buddha and his contemporary pupils have described so many matters of the Nirgrantha cult as if they were eye-witnesses, even though the description might be only incidental and critical.

The references therefore to the thought and conduct of the Nirgrantha cult that we come across in the Bauddha Pitakas, is historically very important. Later on we have references in the works of the Buddhist sects about the Nirgrantha cult and we have references to the same in the Agama literature. If the two are compared, we have no doubt that both are equally authentic even if there be two opposed sides. The composition and collections in the Bauddha Pitakas and the ancient Nirgrantha Agama are more or less the same.

Buddha and Mahâvîra

Buddha and Mahâvîra were near contemporaries. Both supported the Sramana cult. We cannot yet derive any conclusions without knowing the distance of time between the two. The first difference is this Starting with his great voyage–Mahabhiniskramana he propagated his new path or dharmacakra He continued acceptance and rejection of the different tapasvi and yogi sects during the course of these six years. The path of dharma, however, which Mahâvîra had acquired in his family tradition was accepted by him. He proceeded further on the same path, brought about change and improvement in it according to his own understanding and capability. The path of Buddha was that of rejection of old sects and the establishment of a new religious order; the path of Mahâvîra was simply that of reconsideration and research in his family-religion. We therefore see that Buddha evaluates at several places, the thinking of the sects rejected or accepted by him and states: "the leader of this particular sect holds this belief, another holds this. I do not agree with them; I hold this view" etc., Nowhere in the Pitakas does Buddha state thus–"What I hold is only inherited from the old; I am only its propagator." There is only one sentiment at the root of all statements of Buddha. It is that "My path is the result of my own pursuit." Mahâvîra does not say so. The proof is that once a few followers of Parsvanatha asked some questions to Mahâvîra quoting the authority of the words of Parsvanatha who brought them to his own fold ![1] This is

precisely the reason why Buddha has not co-ordinated the views of any predecessor or contemporary with his own; he has expressed the traits of his own outlook, Mahâvîra has not done this. He has co-ordinated his own reforms and changes with the then followers of Parsvanatha.[2] The path therefore of Mahâvîra is suggestive of the inclination of co-ordination with the sect of Parsvanatha.

Another point to be drawn attention to is the life-time of Buddha and Mahâvîra. Buddha attained Nirvana at the age of eighty; Mahâvîra at seventy two. It is now more or less a proved fact that Buddha preceded Mahâvîra in Nirvana.[3] Buddha was slightly older than Mahâvîra. Again, when Mahâvîra independently started preaching of his religion, Buddha had already established his cult. Buddha was expected to gain strength from more and more of followers of his path; Mahâvîra had to keep within his fold and influence the old followers of Parsvanatha in addition to winning over new followers of his cult. Buddha could not have succeeded in the formation of his Sangha without a complete evaluation and rejection of all other contemporary sects. Mahâvîra's problem was slightly different. He brought to his own fold the contemporary followers of Parsvanatha on the strength of his own conduct and the strength of his own personality, which won their hearts.

The problem therefore, of recruitment of new followers was not as acute for Mahâvîra as for Buddha. It is , therefore, full of criticism of others.

Influence of Nirgrantha tradition on Buddha

Buddha discarded several sects one after the other, before he established his own path. One of these was the Nirgrantha path; Buddha has narrated his own life.[4] On reading this and comparing it with the conduct described in the Jaina Agamas, it can be known without doubt that Buddha had passed some time of his life in the Jain cult as in others. Mahâvîra had not carved his path during the period of the Sadhana of Buddha and at that time in eastern India there existed no sect other than the Nirgrantha path of Parsvanatha. This shows that just for some time, Buddha passed his life in the Nirgrantha cult of Parsvanatha. As a result of this, Buddha severely attacks austerity-tapas that was firmly

established in the Nirgrantha cult when he analyses its conduct and thought. During the course of this attack, he describes in fairly good details, the Nirgrantha cult in its own terminology. The time of preaching of Buddha and Mahâvîra was the same for some years. It seems further that they toured the same regions without ever meeting each other. That is the reason why the Pitakas refer to Lord Mahâvîra as "Nataputta Niggantha"

Four Yamas and Buddhist Cult

The great vows-Mahavratas of the Nirgranthas are discussed in the Dighanikaya and Samyuttanikaya of the Bauddha Pitakas[5] In the Samanna sutta of Dighanikaya of the Bauddha Pitakas, Ajatasatru-Kunika, the son of Srenika-Bimbisara gives a narration of his meeting with Jnataputra Mahâvîra in this Jnata putra Mahâvîra tells that the Nirgrantha is controlled by the Chaturyama Samvara; only such a Nirgrantha is of controlled self-yatatma—and steady self sthitatma In the same way, a person Ninka by name, tells Buddha that Jnataputra Mahâvîra is compassionate, clever and endowed with Caturyama, the reference is in the Devadattasamyutta of Samyuttanikaya These Buddhist references inform us that in the times of Buddha, and even later till the Pitakas, assumed their final shape, the Buddhist tradition looked upon Mahâvîra and his other Nirgranthas as endowed with Caturyama 'Yama' means a great vow-Mahavrata, which is also known as 'Yama' in 'Yogasastra' (2.30). Till this time, the Nirgrantha tradition of Mahâvîra was endowed with five great vows and it is known by the same designation in the scriptures and the worldly ways Under this state of affairs what are we to understand when the Buddhist works know Mahâvîra and other Nirgranthas as holding four great vows ? This is a very natural question.

The reply to this question can be had from the Jaina Agamas available then Fortunate we are that we have, in the then available Agamas, so many levels of ancient thought of the Nirgrantha tradition that enlighten us regarding the tradition itself as also the condition of the Nirgrantha tradition of the earlier Parsvapatyika Agamas like the Bhagavati and Uttaradhyayana tells us[6] that many Parsvapatyika Nigranthas, who were upholders

of four great vows, accepted the preaching of Mahâvîra and adopted the five great vows as preached by Lord Mahâvîra. He thus changed the older tradition of four great vows. However, there were some Parsva patyika Nirgranthas who continued the old tradition of four great vows. One more historical problem is this. Why and when did Mahâvîra establish five great vows in place of the old four ? The reply to this 'why' is given by the Jaina works. They however, give no reply to the 'when'. Bhagavan Parsvanatha had firmly established the four great vows of non-violence, truth, non-stealth and non-acceptance. But in due course, looseness crept in, in the Nirgrantha tradition. This looseness went to this extent that certain Nirgranthas confined the meaning of the word 'Aparigraha' to non collection, and kept contact with women even without collection or acceptance and believed that the vow of Aparigraha is not broken thereby. Bhagavan Mahâvîra wanted to remove this looseness and so established the vow of celibacy-Bhrahmacarya-independently of this Aparigraha and tried to purify the fourth vow thereby. It is not possible to state as to when, during the coarse of is sermonizing, he established the vow of Brahmacarya apart from Aparigraha But the vow was laid down with so much of emphasis than the Niragrantha cult came to glorify the five great vows. Those Parsvapatyika Nirgranthas who remained aloof from the five great vows of Mahâvîra almost ceased to exist in no time If the four great vows were not mentioned by the Bauddha Pitakas and the Jaina Agamas, we would not have known that for a time this tradition upheld four vows.

We come to know automatically from this discussion that in the beginning, when Jnataputra Mahâvîra took to the initiation of the Parsva patyika Nirgrantha tradition, he had adopted only four great vows But looking to the position of the cult he undertook reform now and then. The dialogue and discussion that took place on these in the ancient Nirgrantha tradition are partially revealed in the dialogue between Kesi and Gautama in the Uttaradhyayana Sutra Certain Parsvapatyika Nirgrantha doubted and asked this. If liberation is the only aim of both Parsvanatha and Mahâvîra, why do we find difference in their preaching regarding the great vows ? Kesi submitted this question

before Gautama and the latter clarified it. Kesi was delighted and he accepted the order of Lord Mahâvîra.

We can easily came to the following conclusions on the basis of this discussion—

(1) Before Mahâvîra, there was a custom of acceptance of four great vows at least from the time Parsvanatha. Mahâvîra slightly changed it and developed it into five great vows. Only this developed form is, without any controversy whatsoever, accepted by all Jain sections, while the ancient custom of four great vows is preserved only in the Scriptures.

(2) Buddha himself and all the Bhiksus who were his contemporaries and followers, looked upon the Nirgrantha tradition as comprising of only four great vows, they did not know of the internal reform that brought these to five They repeatedly gave expression to what Buddha stated once and what became popular in the common public, in their works.

Buddha has laid down five Silas or vows These are similar to the Yamas of the Nirgrantha tradition from the viewpoint of number, but with a difference, It is that the fifth vow is Aparigraha non-acceptance in the Nirgrantha tradition, but it is abandonment of wine etc in the Buddhist tradition.

It is true that four *Yamas* are referred to at several places in the Buddhist works, but its meaning in the original Pitakas and its Attha stories is wrong and lacks in clarity. What is it due to ? In the first instance we would be surprised that the Buddha writers were ignorant of and unclear about the Nirgrantha tradition in their neighbourhood that was contemporary and renowned and had accepted four Yamas. But when we consider the position of the cult then, our surprise disappears. No cult has even given full justice to the other. It is possible that in the beginning Buddha and his contemporary pupils know the precise meaning of the word 'Caturyama' It was known to all and needed no elaboration But with the process of the collection of the Pitakas in progress, it was found necessary to clarify the meaning of 'Caturyama'. Some Bauddha Bhiksus, through the force of his imagination supplemented the meaning, and with time this continued and nobody cared to assess whether or not this meaning was acceptable to the Nirgrantha tradition. At several places, the same

thing has happened about the Buddhas at the hands of the Jainas. The real and authentic form of the beliefs of any cult can possibly be known only from its own works and tradition.

[Darsana aur Cintan, pt. 2, pp. 50-59, 97-100]

References

1 Bhagavati 5 9 225
2. Uttaradhyayana, Adh. 23.
3 Viranirvana Samvat aur Jain Kalaganana-Bharatiya vidya pt 3 p 177
4 Majjhimanikaya S. 26-Fudhacarita (in Gujarati) by Prof Kaustambi
5 Dighanikaya S 2.
6 The Mahâvira Issue of 'Utthana' (Sthanakavasi Jain Conference, Bombay, P 46)

14

A REMARK ON THE PROBLEM OF THE DATE OF MAHÂVÎRA

—Heinz Bechert

The chronology of Mahâvîra has been discussed by scholars for a long time with a view to determining the exact place of Jainism in Indian and World History A certain degree of *communis opinio* has been agreed on by modern scholars that *Mahâvîra* attained Nirvana around 468 B C. If the historicity of this date could be established, we would be in the fortunate position of possessing an established chronology for a period long before Alexander's Indian Campaigns. We should, however, carefully test the foundations on which this assumption rests.

To begin with, the usually accepted date of Mahâvîra's Nirvana is not in accordance with the date of Mahâvîra's Nirvana as recorded by the Jainas themselves. The Svetambaras place it in 528 B C , and the Digambaras in 510 B.C. The date 468 B.C which is found in modern scholarly publications, is based on rather complicated calculations by Hermann Jacobi, Jarl Charpentier and others These scholars derived their information mainly from the works of Hemacandra and Merutunga.

Concerning the arguments presented by H Jacobi, I would like to draw reader's attention to his remarks in the introduction to his edition of Hemacandra's *Sthaviravalicanta* or *Parisistaparvan* There, he states that the historical character of at least some of the patriarchs in the *Sthaviravali* has already been established by Georg Buhler, and that the part of the *Sthaviravali* which we can now control proves to contain an on the whole trustworthy account of the development of the Svetambara branch of the Jainas which shows only such accidental mistakes and omissions as may be expected to occur in a late redaction of an oral tradition.[1]

On the other hand, Jacobi found the greatest difficulty in adjusting the list of the patriarchs to fit with the chronology as handed down in the same sources. To quote again from Jacobi's introduction: "and as Bhadrabahu died 170 A.V., and Rohagupta was living in 544 A.V. the intermediate four patriarchates should have lasted 374 years ! This interval yields an average length of each patriarchate, in this period of about 94 years ! This is quite absurd. On the other hand, the interval of 40 years between the last two schisms covers, in the *Theravali,* four patriarchates, each of an average duration of no more than ten years, a result which errs in an opposite sense from the preceding one."[2]

Surprisingly, Jacobi, without any attempt at explaining this contradiction of his earlier statement that the *Theravali* proves to contain a reliable account of the parampara of teachers, continues with the statement that "we arrive at the conclusion that the list of there as is imperfectly handed down; there must have been far more theras than are contained in the *Theravali*"[3] Evidently, this conclusion is based on his rather absolute faith in the chronological information found in the sources, though, in the very next sentence, Jacobi states : "One fundamental fault vitiating the early records of the Jainas is the confusion prevailing in their system of chronology."[4]

Such confusion becomes visible indeed if we review the various attempts of Indian and Western scholars to establish the chronology of Mahâvîra In his so-called second approach, Jacobi claimed to have disproved the statement found in three *Sutras* of the *Tipitaka (Pasadikasuttanta* and *Sangitisuttanta* of the *Dighnikaya,* and *Samagamasutta* of the *Majjhimanikaya*) that Nigantha Nataputta, i e. Mahâvîra, passed away before the Buddha. This he does on the strength of a purely chronological argument. viz of the date 484 B.C. which he calculated for the Buddha's Nirvana and the date 477 B.C. for Mahâvîra's Nirvana as calculated from Hemacandra's *Parisistaparvan*. Both dates are reckoned back from Candragupta's accession to the throne, viz. 162 years in the Buddhist chronicles from Ceylon, but only 155 years in Hemacandra's *Parisista.*

No less problematic are the arguments of some other scholars, e.g. of K.P. Jayaswal who places Mahâvîra's Nirvana in

546 B.C. and of A. Santiraja Sastri who calculates 662 B.C. A group of Jain scholars, including Muni Kalyana Vijayaji, Shanti Lal Shah, Muni Shri Nagrajj and others argue in favour of the traditional date, 528 or 527 B.C. while H.C. Seth proposes 488 B.C., C. D. Chatterjee 486 B.C. etc. etc.

The question of the reliability of the chronology as handed down in Jain sources has already been discussed by Andre Bareau in his fundamental contribution on the date of the Buddha's Nirvana [5] There, he arrived at the conclusion that "the most decisive argument" for the generally agreed date of 468 B C. for the Nirvana of Mahâvîra consists of its agreement with the generally accepted date of the Nirvana of the Buddha, viz., ca. 480 B.C.

If this is the case, however, the date of Mahâvîra's Nirvana as calculated by modern scholars on the basis of Jaina traditional chronology, cannot be upheld any more. I refer here to my contribution on the date of the Buddha[6] where it has been established that the so-called corrected Ceylonese chronology. i e ca. 480 B.C does not represent a reliable historical tradition There cannot be much doubt that the Buddha's Nirvana should be dated much later, probably around 350 B.C.

However, apart from the Buddhist chronology, another argument in favour of the traditionally adopted Jaina chronology has been quoted. As J Filliozat has pointed out, the date 313 B.C. for Candragupta's accession to the throne is not only handed down in a particular Jaina chronlogy, but also in ancient Western sources.[7] Therefore, this Jaina chronology must be founded on an ancient and reliable chronological tradition. The question remains, however, what conclusions we may draw from this ancient chronological information. Though it provides a correct date for Candragupta's accession to the throne, this does not necessarily imply that the author had correct chronological information for the earlier period. To recall a corresponding case from the discussion of the early Buddhist sources, we known that Ceylonese chronology is reliable from Dutthagamani onwards, but not earlier, though the list of kings is reliable as far back as Devanampiyatissa who is dated 65 years too early in the Ceylonese chronoicles. Moreover, there is no agreement of the Jaina chronology of the early period with that of the Buddhist

sources, because 528 B.C. for the Nirvana of Mahâvîra would lead us to ca. 525 for Buddha's Nirvana, but not to 544 B.C. nor 480 B.C. as are reckoned in the traditional and in the corrected Ceylonese chronologies respectively.

Fortunately, the contemporancity of the Buddha and the Mahâvîra remains beyond any doubt, but it seems that so far we do not have convincing arguments for accepting any of the current chronologies for either of the two great teachers.

Therefore, the only way to establish roughly the dates of the Mahâvîra and the Buddha seems to be to calculate from the lists of the so-called patriarchs. In the case of the Buddha's Nirvana, this leads us to a date which is rather near to the so-called short or Indian chronology, and, as I have hinted before, the Jain *Theravali* too suggests a much later date than the one found in our history books.

For further details, I may be allowed to refer to my above-quoted paper on the date of the Nirvana of the Buddha[8] and to a more detailed study on the early Buddhist chronology which is under preparation [9]

It should be added, however, that my doubts about the traditional chronology are fully confirmed by the comprehensive recent study of the early Buddhist and Jaina chronlogy by P.H.L. Eggermont, who arrives at similar results, though partly by a different way of argumentation.[10]

References

1 *Sthaviravalicarita or Parisistaparvan, being an Appendix of the Trisastisalakapurusacarita by Hemacandra*, ed, by Hermann Jacobi, 2nd ed, Calcutta, 1932, Introducting, p XVI

2 *Ibid.*, p XVII

3 *Ibid.*, p XVIII

4 *Ibid.*, p. XVIII

5 Andre Bareau, *La date du Nirvana* in JA (1953), pp. 53-6

6 Heinz Bechert, *The Date of the Buddha Reconsidered*, in IT, 10 (1982) pp. 29-36

7 Jean Filliozat, *La date de Tavenement de Candragupta roi du Magadha*, in 'Journal des savants' (1978) pp 175-84.

8 See above, note 6.

9. This study is to appear in the NAWG, and it will include a re-examination of the problems posed by the so-called Dotted Record

10 P.H.L Eggermont, *New Notes on Asoka and his Successors*, in 'Persica', 2 (1965-66), pp 27-70, 4 (1969), p 77-120; 5 (1970-71), pp 69-102 and 8 (1979), pp 55-93 See particularly 5, pp 95-8, pp. 57-69 and 82-8.

15

THE DATE OF MAHÂVÎRA*

—P.C. Roy Choudhari

The date of Mahâvîra, like that of the Buddha, occupies a very important place in ancient Indian chronology, but it has not attracted as much attention of scholars as the date of the Buddha. Indeed, after Jarl Charpentier considered the problem in the Indian Antiquary of 1914 and the Cambridge History of India, Volume I, in 1922, H C Seth was the only scholar to take it up seriously in rècent times and suggest a new date based on the Buddhist tradition.[1] We intend to suggest here a new date for Mahâvîra, but it is not completely new in the sense that it is based on the Buddhist tradition We shall put this date to suitable tests with a view to examining its correctness These tests will also, however, be based mainly on the Buddhist tradition itself which has rightly come to be regarded as very reliable for ancient Indian history

Generally speaking, two dates of Mahâvîra's death hold the field They are —

(1) 527 B.C (Hoernle,[2] Guerinot[3]), and

(2) 467 B C (Jacobi[4], Charpentier[5]),

(A) The date 527 B C is based on the tradition recorded by Merutunga, a famous Jain author, who flourished in the fourteenth century He gives as a basis for an adjustment between the Vira and Vikrama eras the famous verses, first quoted by Buhler[6] and after him discussed by Jacobi The English translation of the verses which is taken from Buhler, is as follows :—

"Palaka, the lord of Avanti, was anointed in that night in which Arhat and Tirthankara Mahâvîra entered Nirvana. (1)

"Sixty are (the years) of king Palaka, but one hundred and

* History of Bihar, Bombay, 1967.

fifty-five are (the years) of the Nandas; one hundred and eight those of the Mauryas, and thirty those of *Pusamitta* (Pushyamitra). (2).

"Sixty (years) ruled Balamitra and Bhanumitra, forty Nabhovahana Thirteen years likewise (lasted) the rule of Gardabhilla, and four are (the years) of Saka. (3)."

Thus there was a gap of 60+155+108+30+60+40+13+4 = 470 years between the death of Mahâvîra and the end of Saka rule (*i. e.*, victory of Vikrama)

This date (or 528 B.C. according to those authorities who regard 58 B.C. as the starting point of the Vikrama era) is wholly rejected by Charpentier on the following grounds[7] .—

1. "The Jains themselves have preserved chronological records concerning Mahâvîra and the succeeding pontiffs of the Jain church, which may have been begun at a comparatively early date. But it seems quite clear that, at the time when these lists were put into their present form, the real date of Mahâvîra had already either been forgotten or was at least doubtful" (p 155)

2 "The traditional date of Mahâvîra's death on which the Jains base their chronological calculations corresponds to the year 470 before the foundation of the Vikrama era in 58 B C , i.e. 528 B C. This reckoning is based mainly on a list of kings and dynasties, who are supposed to have reigned between 528 and 58 B C., but

(a) the list is absolutely valueless, as it confuses rulers of Ujjain, Magadha and other kingdoms, and

(b) some of these may perhaps have been contemporary, and not successive as they are represented (p. 153).

3. "Moreover, if we adopt the year 528 B.C., it would exclude every possibility of Mahâvîra having preached his doctrine at the same time as the Buddha, as the Buddhist texts assert, for there is now a general agreement among scholars that the Buddha died within a few years of 480 B.C." (pp. 155-156)

4 "Finally, both Mahâvîra and the Buddha were contemporaries with a king of Magadha whom the Jains call Kunika, and the Buddhists Ajatasatru; and he began his reign only eight years before the Buddha's death. Therefore, if

Mahâvîra died in 528 B.C., he could not have lived in the reign of Kunika" (p. 156).

H.C. Raychaudhari[8] furnishes some additional arguments for rejecting this date :—

1. "In the first place, it is at variance with the testimony of Hemacandra, who places Mahâvîra's Nirvana only 155 years before Candragupta Maurya" (p. 85).

2 "Again, some Jain texts place the Nirvana 470 years before the *birth* of Vikrama and not his *accession*, and as this event, according to the Jains, did not coincide with the foundation of the era of 58 B.C. attributed to Vikrama, the date 528 B.C. for Mahâvîra's death can hardly be accepted as representing a unanimous tradition" (p. 85)

If we study the details of the list of kings and dynasties provided by Merutunga, we find the following irregularities as well—

1. The reign-periods of certain dynasties and kings are completely unacceptable, e.g., a total of 155 years has never been allowed to the Nandas by any tradition. With a view to defending the Jain tradition, it may be argued that possibly the list indicates the reign-periods of kings and dynsties who ruled over Ujjain and not Magadha. But even in that case, such a long period for the Nandas cannot be defended.[9]

2. The Great Satrap Nahapana, who is usually identified with Nabhovahana of the tradition, flourished after Vikrama according to competent authorities Inclusion of such a post-Vikrama figure in this Jain tradition renders it all the more valueless.

3. As is well-known, the story of Vikrama and the end of Saka rule is of much later growth. Kielhorn[10] long ago proved that the connection of the era commencing 57 B.C. with a king Vikramaditya of Ujjayini, who perhaps never existed, was not established till a very late date, the first mention of '*Vikrama Samvat*' being made in an inscription at Dholpur of *Samvat* 898 = A.D. 842. Hence any tradition which incorporates this story must be used with great caution.

(B) The second date of Mahâvîra's death, i.e., 467 B.C., is based on a tradition recorded by the great Jain author

Hemacandra (A.D. 1088-1172), who says that 155 years after the liberation of Mahâvîra, Candragupta become king (*Sthaviravalicarita, Parisishtaparvan,* VIII 339). As pointed out by Charpentier,[11] who like Cunningham and Max Muller, believes that the Buddha's nirvana took place in 477 B.C. (and not in 487 B.C. as we believe), this date has some good points in its favour—

1 The Buddha (d 477 B.C.) and Mahâvîra (d. 467 B.C.) become contemporaries.

2. Ajatasatru becomes the contemporary of both the teachers.

3. This is in keeping with the Jain tradition of Hemacandra that there was a gap of 155 years between the death of Mahâvîra and the accession of Candragupta Maurya.

(Be it noted that according to the Jain tradition, the accession of Candragupta Maurya took place in 312 B.C , a date not regarded as correct by scholars for the accession of Candragupta Maurya.)

4 According to the Jain tradition, the Jain pontiff Sambhutavijaya died exactly in the year after Candragupta's accession, or 156 after Vira, which may after all perhaps be the very same year as Hemacandra says that the one hundred and fifty-fifth year had passed (*gata*). Bhadrabahu, the successor of Sambhutavijaya, died fifteen years later. All Jain traditions from Hemacandra downwards gives 170 after Vira as the year of Bhadrabahu's death. This would be 297 B.C. if the date 467 B.C. is accepted for Mahâvîra's death; and all Jain traditions also bring Bhadrabahu into the closest connection with Candragupta in whose reign the date 297 B.C. falls.

5. The *Kalpasutra* was finished 980 years after Mahâvîra, but in another recession the number is 993. The commentaries, all going back to the old *curni,* refer this date to four different events. One such event is the public recitation of the *Kalpasutra* before king Dhruvasena of Anandapura whose reign lasted from A .D. 526 to A.D. 540. Thus we find a most remarkable coincidence, for 993-467 = 526, or just the year of Dhruvasena's accession to the throne of Valabhi.

6. The Jain creed is called in Buddhist literautre *caturyama,* 'consisting in four restrictions'. But Mahâvîra enforced five great

vows upon his followers. From this Charpentier concluded that Mahâvîra did not finally fix his doctrine of the five vows before a somewhat later date, when the Buddha was already out of any connection with him

7 Bimbisara[12] is the main ruler in the Buddhist canonical texts, and Ajatasatru does not appear so very much there. In the Jain canon Kunika plays a far more important role in the life of Mahâvîra. This may point to a later period of Ajatasatru's reign

Although the date 467 B.C. (suggested long ago by Jacobi and strongly supported by Charpentier) has good points in it, it presents two very serious difficulties—

1 First, this "date does not accord with the explicit statement in some of the earliest Buddhist texts that Mahâvîra predeceased the Buddha" (H.C Raychaudhari) Charpentier also knows that this date is "contradicted by a passage in the Buddhist *Digha-Nikaya*[13] which tells us that Nigantha Nataputta—the name by which the Buddhists denote Mahâvîra—died before Buddha. This assertion is, however, in contradiction with other contemporaneous statements, and forms" for him "no real obstacle to the assumption of the date 468 B.C" (CHI, I, p. 156). He adds that he considers "this evidence too strong to be thrown over on account of this passage in the Pali canon" (IA, 1914, p. 177).

For several reasons it is very difficult to agree with Charpentier—

(a) The Jain tradition was collected and reduced to writing much later and hence it is not as reliable as the Buddhist tradition

(b) Even the Jain tradition is not unanimous about the date of Mahâvîra's death. There are several traditions[14] about this, which rather shake our belief in them.

(c) The insertion of Vikrama and the Sakas in the Jain tradition strengthens our suspicion.

(d) The Buddhist tradition is more reliable as it was reduced to writing very early Moreover, due to its comparatively more reliability, it has been used in the reconstruction of ancient Indian history. Hence, there should be no valid objection to its use in determining the date of Mahâvîra.

2. Secondly, Charpentier's calculation is based on the assumption that the Buddha died in 477 B C This date has since been discarded and the date of the Buddha's death has been fixed at 487 B.C. as this is the date arrived at on the basis of the Cantonese tradition, the *Mahavamsa* and the inscriptions of Asoka [15] In order to discredit the tradition of the *Mahavamsa* that *Asoka* was formally crowned 218 years after the death of the Buddha, Charpentier had to take recourse to an utterly untenable argument saying that "the 218 years did not refer originally to the *abhisheka*, but to the completion of the conquest of Kalinga or to the first conversion, or to both these events" (IA, 1914, p 170)

There are some other theories as well about Mahâvíra's date which we may notice in passing.

(C) S N Pradhan[16] holds the date 480 B.C (= 325 +155) or 477 B C. (= 322 + 155) for the death of Mahâvîra, accepting Hemacandra who says thatChandraguptabecame king 155 years after the death of Mahâvîra

(D) "Certain Jain writers assume an interval of eighteen years between the *birth* of Vikrama and the foundation of the era attributed to him, and thereby seek to reconcile the Jain tradition about the date of Mahâvîra's Nirvana (58+18+470 = 546 B C) with the Ceylonese date of the Great Decease of the Buddha (544 B C) But the suggestion can hardly be said to rest on any reliable tradition Merutunga places the death of the last Jina or Tirthankara 470 years before the end of Saka rule and the *victory* and not *birth* of the traditional Vikrama" (H C Raychaudhari *An advanced History of India*, p 86)

(E) "Certain Jain Sutras seem to suggest that Mahâvîra died about sixteen years after the accession of Ajatasatru and the commencement of his wars with his hostile neighbours This would place the Nirvana of the Jain teacher eight years after the Buddha's death, as, according to the Ceylonese Chronicles, the Buddha died eight years after the enthronement of Ajatasatru The Nirvana of the Tirthankara would, according to this view, fall in 478 B C., if we accept the Cantonese reckoning (486 B.C) as our basis, and in 536 B C., if we prefer the ceylonese epoch.

"The date 478 B.C. would almost coincide with that to which the testimony of Hemacandra leads us, and place the

accession of ChandraguptaMaurya,in 323 B.C., which cannot be far from the truth. But the result in respect of Mahâvîra himself as at variance with the clear evidence of the Buddhist canonical texts which make the Buddha *survive* his Jnatrika rival.

"The Jain statement that their Tirthankara died some sixteen years after the accession of Kunika (Ajatasatru) can be reconciled with the Buddhist tradition about the death of the same teacher before the eighth year of Ajatasatru if we assume that the Jains, who refer to Kunika as ruler of Champa,begin their reckoning from the accession of that prince to the viceregal throne of Champa,while the Buddhists make the accession of Ajatasatru to the royal throne of Rajagrha the basis of their calculation" (H C Raychaudhari p 86)

(F) In the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1917, S V. Venkateswara wrote an article entitled "The Date of Vardhamana" (page 122-130) in which he suggested, "the date 437 B C or 470 of the Ananda Vikrama era" as the date of the nirvana of Vardhamana, "the founder of modern Jainism " His view is based on the Svapnavasavadatta of Bhasa wherein the Sanskrit dramatist "introduces Pradyota as seeking the hand of Darsaka's sister in mariage for his own son" (p 129) The reigns period of Darsaka as accepted by Venkateswara is 437-413 B.C Thus Canda Pradyota was alive at the beginning of the reign of Darsaka Jain tradition[17] is to the effect that Vardhamana died on the same day as Canda Pradyota of Avanti. Thus "the founder of the Jain faith must have seen Darsaka's reign (i e. 437-413 B C.) if it be true that both Vardharnana and Canda died about the same time" (pp 124-125).

This view can be easily refuted on the basis of what has already been said

(G) H C Seth[18] suggests 488 B.C as the date of Mahâvîra's death on the basis of the Buddhist tradition, assuming 487 B C as the date of the Buddha's death. As he says

"The great difficulty in accepting 468 B.C as the date for Mahâvîra Nirvana will be that it will place Mahâvîra's death several years after that of the Buddha The traditions preserved in the Buddhist Pali canon clearly tell us that Nigantha Nataputta, *i e* , Mahâvîra died at Pava a little before the Buddha.[19] Jacobi

and Charpentier have rather lightly set aside this old Buddhist tradition" (p. 820).

"The traditional chronology of the Svetambara sect of the Jains given in the *Tepagaccha Pattavali* and Merutunga's *Vicarasreni* which has been made familiar by European scholars like Buhler, Jacobi and Charpentier, puts Mahâvîra Nirvana 470 years before the Vikrama era (pp. 817-818).

"All the Jain traditions assign 40 years of reign to Nahavana or Nahapana, whose reign therefore lasted up to 605 years (430 between Mahâvîra Nirvana and Vikrama + 135 of Vikrama's dynasty + 40 of Nahavana) after Mahâvîra Nirvana" (p. 834). Now his main argument is as follow—

"Nahavana is, in all probability, as is generally believed by modern historians, the same as Nahapana, the Maha-Kshatrapa or Kshaharata family, who is mentioned in several inscriptions and a large number of whose coins are also discovered... The modern historical reasearches put Nahapana in the period after the commencement of the Vikrama era..... If we take out 40 years of Nahavana from 470 years, the interval given in these traditions between Mahâvîra Nirvana and the commencement of the Vikrama era, the difference between these two important events will be 430 years. This will give (430+58) 488 B.C., as the date of Mahavira Nirvana. This will place Mahavira's death about a year before that of the Buddha, who died, as suggested above, in 487 B.C. These two dates will reconcile most of the Buddhist as well as the Jain traditions about these two great religious teacher's (pp. 831-832).

We fully agree with him that whatsoever date we accept, the Buddha and Mahâvîra must be shown contemporaries, otherwise the date cannot be correct. But we suggest a modification in it.

The Christian year changes in our Pausha. This may be applicable to B.C. dates as well If we say that Mahâvîra died in 488 B.C. and the Buddha died in 487 B.C., seemingly there is a difference of one year between these two events. But really speaking, there is a difference of $6\frac{1}{2}$ months only; because Mahâvîra died in the month of Kartika in 488 B.C., the year changed in Pausha, and 487 B.C. began from that month and in Vaisakha of the same year (487 B.C.) the Buddha died. From

Buddhist literature we know that some time, evidently more than one or two years, passed between the deaths of the two teachers, because it is recorded that the Buddha passed his last rainy season (evidently in 488 B.C.) at Vaisali. So 488 B.C. as the date of Mahâvîra's death will have to be given up and we should see if we can find out a date of Mahâvîra's death somewhere near that, which is in keeping with other details.

After a comparison of the details of the lives of the Buddha and Mahâvîra, especially the places where they spent their rainy seasons, we have come to the conclusion that Mahâvîra died in 490 B.C (November) and that he had been born in 561 B.C. (April). He was alive for 71 years and $6\frac{1}{2}$ months. The Buddha was born in 567 B.C (May) and he died in 487 B.C (May). He was alive exactly for 80 years.

In the Buddhist *Tripitaka* literature (M., II. 3 7) it is stated in most unequiovcal terms that one particular rainy season was spent at Rajagrha by the Buddha as well as Mahâvîra and five other heretical teachers Scholars so far have not paid serious attention to it. Had they done it, perhaps they would have been able to find out the correct date of Mahâvîra. Charpentier also knew this passage and certain other passages of the same type. On page 126 (foot-note 29) of the Indian Antiquary for 1914, he says—"The *Majjh, Nik.* II, p 2 sq. tells us how the six heretical teachers once spent the rainy season in Rajagrha at the same time as the Buddha Mahâvîra spent fourteen of his *varshas* there according to the *Kalpasutra* 122 " But he, too, ignored it. This passage, as a matter of fact, provides us with another means from the Buddhist side (besides the one indicating that Mahâvîra predeceased the Buddha) to arrive at the correct date of Mahâvîra

Now we proceed to find out the date of that specific rainy season The following works are very useful in the quest. *Buddhacarya* (in Hindi) by Rahul Sankrityayana (2nd ed., Banaras, 1952) and *Sramana Bhagavan Mahâvîra* (in English) by Muni Ratna-Prabha Vijaya, Vol. II, Parts I and II (Ahmedabad, 1928 and 1951) respectively. According to the former, the date of the Buddha is 563 B.C.—483 B.C. and according to the latter, the date of Mahâvîra is 597 B.C.—526 B.C.

In *Buddhacarya*, which is a systematised collection of the Hindi translation of the selected passages from ancient Buddhist literature, especially *Tripitka* literature, it is stated (p. 248) that the Lord Buddha spent his 17th rainy season (after enlightenment) at Rajagrha; and then follows the Hindi translation *Mahasakuludayi-Sutta* (M., II. 3-7) in which it is said (p. 249) that on that particular occasion both the Buddha and Nigantha Nataputta spent their rainy season at Rajagrha. Taking 567 B.C. as the date of the birth of the Buddha this comes to 516 B.C.

On the basis of the life of Mahâvîra written by Muni Ratna-Prabha Vijaya, who has closely followed the early traditional literature on the subject, we find that if we take 561 B C. as the date of the birth of Mahâvîra, he spent one of his rainy seasons in 516 B.C. at Rajagrha This was his 16th rainy season in his ascetic life (*i. e.*, after leaving his home which event took place in December of 532 B C. according to our calculation). In the rainy season of 513 B C. also both the Buddha and Mahâvîra were at Rajagrha. So the date 561 B.C. as the date of the birth of Mahâvîra is able not only to show that the Buddha survived Mahâvîra but also to make both the teachers spend the same rainy season at Rajagrha. This is highly useful in as much as it also confirms the statement in the Buddhist literature and shows that Pali texts are not fancy and invention.'

As Charpentier collected, though for a different purpose, some examples of this situation when the Buddha and Mahâvîra were living at the same place or in the same locality we shall begin with the passages pointed out by Charpentier (IA, 1914, pp. 126-128).

1. "The well-known introduction to the *Samannaphalasutta* (D I. p. 47 sq) telling us how king Ajatasatru of Magadha paid visits to one after another of the six heretical teachers Purana Kassapa, Makkhali Gosala, Ajita Keshakambala, Pakudha Kaccayana, Sanjaya Belathiputta and Nigantha Nataputta to hear their doctrines, and at last discontented with all he had learnt too refuge with the Buddha, may be a little exaggerated, as it is not very credible that Ajatasatru saw seven great teachers after each other in one single night.[20] But the main content of it is undoubtedly true, as much as we can control the facts narrated,

concerning the doctrines of at least two of the teachers, Gosala and Nataputta, by comparison with Jain writings. Moreover, the Jain writings, *e.g* , the *Aupapatika-Sutra* 39 sq., tell us of visits paid by king Kuniya or Koniya (Ajatasatru) to Mahâvîra, and although there are no facts from which to conclude that it is the same visit as that alluded to by the Digha-Nikaya, there are sufficient instances to prove that the imagination of Ajatasatru paying visits to Mahâvîra was quite familiar with Jain writers" (pp. 126-127).

This visit of Ajatasatru to the Buddha took place in 491 B.C. according to our calculation. The rainy season of 491 B.C. was passed by the Buddha at Sravasti. This was his 42nd rainy season after enlightenment. So this Buddhist reference means to say that sometime in the last month (*i.e*, Kartika) of the *caturmasya* the Buddha came to Rajagrha The example of the Buddha's leaving his caturmasya place on the Asvina Purnima (the full-moon day of Asvina, Maha-pravarana day) or later is furnished by Sankrityayana on page 82 of his book. [This was the Buddha's 7th rainy season (526 B.C.) which had been passed at Trayastrimsa].

Thus Buddhist literature says that there was a meeting between the Buddha and Ajatasatru at Rajagrha in the full-moon night of Kartika But what about Mahâvîra ? Ajatasatru mentions before the Buddha (Sankrityayana, p. 430) that he had been to Nigantha Nataputta as well and had held a discussion

Coming to Mahâvîra, as is well-known, he passed his 42nd rainy season (which was his last rainy season) at Madhyama Pava where he died. This, according to our calculation, took place in 490 B.C From the life of Mahâvîra (Vol II, Part II, page 658) we know that "Sramana Bhagavan Mahâvîra lived at Rajagrha Nagara during the rainy season of the forty-first year of his ascetic life." The date of this rainy season will be 491 B.C

Thus it was possible for Ajatasatru to meet the Buddha at Rajagrha after having met Mahâvîra (at Rajagrha).

2. "In *Majjhima Nikaya* I, p 93 sq. Buddha tells his relative, the Sakya prince Mahanaman, of conversation which he had once had with some Nirgrantha ascetics in the neighbourhood of Rajagrha. These disciples of Mahâvîra praised their master as

all-knowing and all-seeing, etc. and there is nothing remarkable in this, for the claim of possessing universal knowledge was a main characteristic of all these prophets, Mahâvîra as well as Gosala, the Buddha as well as Devadatta" (p. 127).

This story is given in detail by Sankrityayana under '*Cula-dukkhakkhandha-Sutta*' on pages 212-216 and the reference by the Buddha to the Nirgranthas of Rajagrha is given on page 214. The date of the event of this *Sutta* is given by Sankrityayana as 514 B C. which is equivalent to 518 B.C. if we regard 487 B.C. as the date of the death of the Buddha. The age of the Buddha given as 49th year which is equivalent to 519 B.C. (May) to 518 B.C. (May). Thus this event might have happened sometime between May 519 B.C. and May 518 B.C.

Now from the life of Mahâvîra (Vol. II, Part II, pp. 141, 200) we know that he passed his 13th rainy season after leaving home (or 1st rainy season after enlightenment) at Rajagrha The date of this according to our calculation is 519 B.C. (July-October), taking 561 B C as the date of Mahâvîra's birth.

Thus we see that it was possible that sometime in 519 B C (either in May-June or July-October) the Buddha contacted at Rajagrha (at Kalasila near Rshigiri) some Nirgranthas who told him that Nigantha Nataputta was all-knowing. Very possibly, as we have seen above, Nigantha Nataputta (Mahâvîra) was himself residing there in the locality, although the text does not make it necessary.

3. "Moreover, there are other instances in the Pali Canon where Mahâvîra is praised in the same way by his followers ; so

(a) in *Majjh, Nik.* II, 31, where Sakuludayi in Rajagrha.

(b) *ibid,* II, 214 sq , where some Nirgrantha monks, and

(c) in *Anguttara* I, 220, where the Licchavi prince, Abhaya, in a conversation with Ananda in Vaisali eulogize Nataputta in the same way. But all these passages speaking in a quite familiar way of Nataputta, his doctrines and his followers seem to prove, that the redactors of the Buddhist canonical writings had a rather intimate knowledge of the communication between Buddhists and Jains in the lifetime of Gutama and Mahâvîra" (p. 127).

Of the three passages above, we have already considered the first one. This is the occasion when both the Buddha and Mahâvîra passed the same rainy season at one and the same

place i. e., Rajagrha. This event took place in 516 B C. according to our calculation as shown above. The other two passages are not relevant for our purposes.

4 "The passage in the *Mahavagga* VI, 31, 1 sq., speaking of the meeting in Vaisali[21] of the general Siha, who afterwards became a lay-disciple of Buddha, with Nataputta has been discussed by Professor Jacobi in S B E. 45, p. xvi. sq..." (p. 127)

The passage is very important as in this it is expressly stated that both the Buddha and Mahâvîra were at Vaisali at that time.

The Hindi translation of the Siha-Sutta (A., VIII, 1.2.2) has been given by Sankrityayana on pages 138-140. He gives the date of this event as 515 B C which is equivalent to 519 B.C. according to our calculation The Buddha spent his 13th rainy season at Chaliya Parvata (p 137) and 14th rainy season as Sravasti (p 158, f n) The date of the 14th rainy season is 519 B C (July-October) according to our calculation

But where was Mahâvîra in the year 519 B C ? He passed his 13th rainy season at Rajagrha (*Life*, Vol. II, Part II, pp. 141, 200) in 519 B C (July-October) according to our calculation and 14th rainy season at vaisali (life, Vol II, Part II, p. 231) in 518 B.C (July-October) From the *Life* (page 200) again we know that "Soon after the rainy season, Sramana Bhagavan Mahâvîra left Rajagrha, and went in the direction of Videha " Then Muni Ratna-Prabha Vijaya mentions Brahmana Kundagrama (p 201) Kshatriya Kundagrama (p 206) as the places visited by Mahâvîra. All these places were suburbs of Vaisali The only place outside the Vaisali area visited by Mahâvîra between his 13th and 14th rainy seasons was Champa (page 227).

Thus combining both the Buddhist and the Jain traditions we can say that both the Buddha and Mahâvîra were at Vaisali in November-December, 519 B C. and that the conversion of Siha to Buddhism also took place at the same time. It may further be added that this was the first visit of Mahâvîra to Vaisali after his enlightenment (May, 519 B C) That is why the Jain tradition mentions the conversion of Rshabha-datta, Devananda, Jamali and Priyadarsana to Jainism on this occasion But it is silent about the conversion of Siha, who was a Nirgrantha, to Buddhism, as it did not like to record such defeats

5. "...and also the well-known *Upali-Sutta* of the *Majjhima Nikaya* (I, p. 371 sq.). Here it is related at considerable length, how Upali, who was a lay follower of Nataputta, went to see Buddha at a time when the two teachers dwelt at Nalanda in order to try to refute him on matters of doctrine. But this attempt had only a scanty result; for Buddha soon converted Upali, and made him his disciple. So Upali went back to his house in Rajagrha, and told his door-keeper no more to admit the Nirgranthas. When Mahâvîra afterwards came with his disciples to see him, Upali declared to his former teacher the reason of his conversion, and eulogised Buddha, his new master... But then and there hot blood gushed forth from the mouth of Niggantha Nataputta, since he was not able to stand the praise of the Venerable One" (p 127).

The *Upalisutta* is also highly important, because the event took place at Nalanda when both the teachers were there.

Rajagrha and Nalanda are close to each other just like, Vaisali and Vanijyagrama or Campa and Prshtha Campa. That is why in the S 122 of the *Kalpasutra* where totals of rainy season passed at different places are indicated, these are shown jointly and not separately. Thus it has been stated therein (quoted in *Life of Mahâvîra,* Vol II, Part II, pages 690-691) that Mahâvîra passed 3 rainy seasons at Campa and Prshtha Campa, 12 rainy seasons at Vaisali and Vanijyagrama and 14 rainy seasons at Rajagrha and Nalanda[22] This joint mention is significant.

Coming to the Buddhist tradition, Rahula Sankrityayana mentions in his *Buddhacarya* that the Buddha spent his 42nd rainy season at Sravasti (page 413, f.n.). The date of this will be 491 B C according to our calculation. From the next page we find the Hindi translation of *Upali-Sutta* (pp. 414-423) with its scene at Nalanda. The date given is 487 B.C which is equivalent to 491 B.C. according to our calculation. The year given is 77th year of the Buddha's life. This will be May 491 B.C to May 490 B.C. according to our calculation. Thus it appears that the event took place between November 491 B.C. and May 490 B.C. as shown above.

Turning to the Jain tradition about the itinerary of Mahâvîra, we have to enquire as to where Mahâvîra was at this

time : whether he was in the Rajagriha-Nalanda area or away from it.

From the *Life of Mahâvîra* (Vol. II, Part II, pages 650-658) we know that Mahâvîra was at Rajagrha (or, in the Rajagrha-Nalanda area, to be more exact and in keeping with the tone of the *Kalpasutras* 122) from November 492 B.C. to the early months of 490 B.C. This is evident from the following quotations :—

"Sramana Bhagavan Mahâvîra lived at Mithila Nagari during the rainy season of the fortieth year of his ascetic life." (page 649). (Date according to our calculation July-October, 492 B C.)

"Soon after the close of the rainy season Sraman Bhagavan Mahâvîra left Mithila and went in the direction of Magadha-desa. Coming to Rajagrha Nagara, the Worshipful Lord put up at Gunasila Caitya outside the town" (page 650) (Date—from November 492 B.C. onwards).

"Sramana Bhagavan Mahâvîra lived at Rajagrha Nagara during the rainy season of the forty-first year of his ascetic life" (page 658) (Date—July-October, 491 B C.)

"Even after the close of rainy season, Sramana Bhagavan Mahâvîra lived at Rajagrha Nagara, for a long time" (page 658) (Date from November 491 B C. onwards for some months).

From Rajagrha he went to Apapa Nagari or Pavapuri (page 664, 682) where he breathed his last in November 490 B.C. (according to our calculation).

Hence the event narrated in the *Upalisutta* is rendered more probable due to the presence of the two teachers in the Rajagrha-Nalanda area in the period from November 491 B.C. to the early months of 490 B.C.

6. "In the *Abhayakumarasutta* (M.N I, 392 sq. it is stated that prince Abhaya was asked in Rajagrha by Nigantha Nataputta to go to Buddha, and put to him the question, whether it was advisable or not to speak words agreeable to other people. By this a trap was to be laid out for him; for if he answered 'no' he would, of course, be wrong, and if he answered 'yes', Abhaya ought to ask, why he had in such fierce terms denounced Devadatta and his apostacy" (p. 128).

Charpentier adds that "too much weight should not be attached to this passage" but we are unable to agree with him.

The date of the event of this *Sutta* is given as 487 B.C. by Sankrityayana (p. 424) which is equivalent to 491 B.C. according to our calculation. The scene of this *Sutta* is Rajagrha where both the Buddha and Mahâvîra are shown as present. We have already shown above that Mahâvîra was at Rajagrha from November 492 B.C. to the early months of 490 B.C. He passed his rainy season of 491 B.C. also at Rajagrha. Thus there is nothing impossible in it.

7. "....*Samy. Nik.* IV, 322 sq. where we are told that Buddha and Nataputta were staying in Nalanda at the same time during a severe famine; when the latter asked his lay-follower the squire (*gamani*) Asibandhakaputta (*cf ibid.*, p. 317 sq.) to go to Buddha and ask him, whether he deemed it right to have all his monks there at that time devouring the food of the poor people" (p. 128, f.n.)

The story of Asibandhakaputta has been narrated on pp. 103-105 by Sankrityayana. It indicates that both the Buddha and Mahâvîra were at Nalanda at the time when there was a famine there. The date of the event is given as 518 B.C. which is equivalent to 522 B.C. according to our calculation. Just above the story is mentioned the fact that the 11th rainy season of the Buddha was passed in the Brahmana village of Nala or Nalada (p. 103). The date of this rainy season according to our calculation is 522 B.C. Thus if Sankrityaya is strictly followed, the event took place sometime after the rainy season, *i.e.*, in November-December, 522 B.C.

Coming to the Jain tradition, we find that Mahâvîra passed his 10th rainy season at Sravasti (*Life*, Vol. II, part I, 472) in 522 B.C. according to our calculation). After the rains he travelled to other places. "Sraman Bhagavan Mahâvîra then went to Rajagrha Nagara. There Isanendra (Indra of Isana devaloka) came, and worshipped the Lord. After making inquiries about Bhagavan's health, he went away" (*Life*, Vol. II, part I, p. 491). Thus Mahâvîra is also at Rajagrha, *i.e.*, in the Rajagrha-Nalanda area at the same time.

The seven passages analysed so far are pointed out in the

article of Charpentier. While reading *Buddhacarya* of Sankrityayana we have come across certain other passages as well in which the Buddha and Mahâvîra are shown at the same place at a particular time. One such is given below :—

8. From the *Cula-Sakuludayi-Sutta* (M., II, 3.9) we know (*Buddhacarya*, pp. 262-267, esp. p. 263) that there was a conversation between Sakula-Udayi and the Buddha at Rajagrha in which a reference was made by Sakula-Udayi to Mahâvîra. The date of this event as given by Sankrityayana is 512 B.C. which is equivalent to 516 B.C according to our calculation. We have already proved above that in 516 B.C. both the Buddha and Mahâvîra passed their rainy season at Rajagrha. (The text in the *Sutta*, however, does not make Mahâvîra's presence at Rajagrha necessary).

Thus my conclusion is that in case the Buddha's date is regarded as 567-487 B C the date of Mahâvîra should be :—

Birth : 561 B C. (April)

Death 490 B.C (November).[23]

Here we would like to point out a mistake usually committed by many. When the date of the death of Mahâvîra is indicated, people find out the date of his birth by adding 72. This is wrong. Mahâvîra was alive for 71 years 6 months and 17 days, i. e., approximately for 72 years. If we add 72, we actually give him a life of $72\frac{1}{2}$ years, i. e., one year more than the real length of his life. It happens in this way Suppose the date of his death is 490 B.C. If we add 72 to this in the usual manner, the date of birth comes to 562 B.C. Now Mahâvîra was born in April and died in November. So from April 562 B.C. to November 490 B.C. will be 72 year and 7 months while the real length of his life is 71 years and about 7 months. Hence we should add only 71 in order to find out the date of his birth.

References

1 See infra for references,

2 A.F.R Hoernle, Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Benga' 1898, pp 39ff

3 Guerinot, Essai de Bibliographie Jain, Paris, 1906, p VII

4 H Jacobi, Kalpa-Sutra of Bhadrabahu, Leipzig, 1879 'On Mahâvîra and His Predecessors', Ind Ant 9, 1880, p 156ff, introductions to S B E, Vols 22 (Oxford, 1884) and 45 (Oxford, 1895)

5 J. Charpentier, 'The Date of Mahâvîra', Ind. Ant., 1914, pp 118-123, 125-133, 167-178; chapter 6 in Cambridge History of India, Vol 1 (Cambridge, 1922), esp. pp. 155-156
6 'Pushpamitra or Pushyamitra ?' in Ind Ant. 2, pp 362-363
7 Cambridge History of India, Vol 1. pp 155-156.
These points are found in a developed form in Ind. Ant 1914.
8 Majumdar, R ychaudhari and Datta, An Advanced History of India, 2nd ed. (London, 1950), Part I, Chapter 6 by H C Raychaudhari, esp pp 85-86.
9 "Not only is the number of years (155) allotted in the gathas to the reign of the Nandas unduly great, but also the introduction of palaka, lord of Avanti, in the chronology of the Magadha kings looks very suspicious" (Jacobi, Kalpasutra of Bhadrabahu, p. 8)
10 'Examination of questions connected with the Vikrama Era' in Ind Ant Vol 19, pp 20-40, 166-187, 354-374; Vol 20, pp 124-142, 397-414
11 Ind Ant 1914
12 See S B E , Vol 50 (Index), p. 99, for the references regarding the Buddha's frequent meetings with Bimbisara
13 Digha-Nikaya, III, pp 117 sq , 209 sq Also Majjhima-Nikaya, II, pp. 273 sq Cf Chalmers, JRAS, 1895, pp 665-666
14 Collected in Pradhan, Chronology of Ancient India (Calcutta, 1927), pp 240-243
15 This has been admirably pointed out by S N Pradhan (op cit) and need not be repeated here
16. Ibid, p. 243
17 The Literary Remains of Dr Bhau Daji, ed Ramachandra Ghosha (Calcutta, 1888), p 130
18 'Mahâvîra Nirvana and some other important dates in Ancient Indian History' in Bharata-Kaumudi, Part II (Allahabad, 1947), pp 817-838 H C Seth's other articles on ancient Indian chronology include· 'Buddha Nirvana and some other dates in Ancient Indian Chronology', Indian Culture, Vol 5 (1938-1939), pp 305-317, 'Beginning of Candragupta Maurya's Reign', Proceedings of the 3rd Indian History Congress, (1939). p 371, also republished in Journal of Indian History Vol 19 (1940), pp 17-21' Chronology of Asokan Inscriptions', Journal of Indian History Vol 17, part III.
19 Digha-Nikaya, III, pp. 117, 209, and Majjhima-Nikaya, II, pp 243 ff. We are told here that while Buddha stayed at Samagama, the report was brought tohim that his rival had died at Pava, and that the Nirgranthas, his followres, were divided by serious schisms According to Jain traditions also Mahâvîra died at Pava (H C Seth).
20 The visit of Ajatasatru is said to have taken place in the full moon of Kartika (about Nov. 1) after the end of the rainy season (Charpentier).
21 The passage is repeated in Ang. Nik. IV, p. 180 sq. (Charpentier)
22. In the 122 of the Kalpasutra Mahâvîra is said to have spent fourteen rainy seasons in Rajagrha and the suburb (bahirika) of Nalanda. This was a famous place even with the Jains, cp , e.g , Sutrakrtanga II, 7 (SBE XLV, 419 sq) (Charpentier, p. 127, f n).
23. In case the Buddha's date is regarded as 566-486 B.C., the date of Mahâvîra in my opinion will be 560-489 B.C.

16

BIRTHPLACE OF LORD MAHÂVÎRA RE-CONSIDERED*

—*Ram Prakash Podaar*

In the Ardhamagadhi Jain Agamas Lord Mahâvîra has been called Videhaputta, Videhasukumara and also Vesaliya (Vaisalika). From this it has been inferred that he was born in the province of Videha at or around the ancient city of Vaisali. His birthplace has been said to be Kundagrama or Ksatriya Kundgrama. Close to this Ksatriya Kundagrama there was a township inhabited by Brahmanas called Brahmana Kundgrama. Acording to the account of the Kalpasutra, the Lord first descended into the womb of Devananda Mahani (Brahmani) of Brahmana Kundagrama. Later, the embryo was transferred to the womb of Tisala Khattiyani (Trisala Ksatriyanı) of Ksatriya Kundagrama

On the strength of the evidence that the Lord has been called Vaisalika, efforts have been made to locate the ancient Ksatriya Kundagrama, ın the vıcınıty of Vaisali.

To the north-east of the present ruins of Vaisali there is a small village called Basokunda It has been identified as the ancient Ksatriya Kundgrama. The Government of Bihar has approved this site as the birthplace of Lord Mahâvîra and a monument is going to be erected ın near future. Arguments on which this identification is based may be summarised as follows—

(i) It is in the vicinity of Vaisali.

(ii) 'Kunda' part of this village-name is the survivor of its prototype in 'Ksatriya Kundagrama'.

(iii) It is very close to the present Kolhua village which is indentified with the ancient settlement called Kollaga

* Vaıshalı Research Bulletın, 1981

Sannivesa where Lord Mahâvîra accepted his first begged food after his initiation into the order of monks.

(iv) To the east of the present ruins of Vaisali there is a village called Kummana Chapra or Kammana Chapra. That in ancient times it was a place of cultural importance is proved by the fact that from the out-skirts of this village a giant size magnificent four-faced Sivalinga has been excavated. The basement contains broken inscriptions in post-Gupta Brahmi character. This village has been tentatively identified with the ancient Karmara Grama (Settlement of the Artisans), which too, like Vanijya Grama, lay in the vicinity of the ancient city of Vaisali. It has been said that the Lord after his initiation into the order of monks, proceeded from Jnatrisanda--the place where he was intitiated, and reached Kammara-Grama before sunset. There was a waterway from Ksatriya Kundagrama (or Jnatrsanda) to Karmara Grama and also a land-route running through the bank. The lord preferred the land route The present Kammana Chapra is hardly at a distance of one kilometer from Basokunda

(v) In the present village of Basokunda there is a patch of land, about two acres in area, which was not being cultivated by the villagers The saying goes that the villagers regarded this patch of land with reverence. Probably this patch of land marks the exact location of Lord Mahâvîra's birthplace.

In this way some enthusiasts have not only discovered the locality but also the exact place of Lord Mahâvîra's birth. But till now this discovery has not received the degree of applause or even approbation which such a discovery should receive The reasons is that there remains ample scope for raising doubts, some of which may be listed as follows :—

(i) Siddartha, the father of Lord Mahâvîra, was a king. Now, if he ruled here, his kingdom lay merely at a distance of two kms. from the capital of the Licchavis. The present ruins of Vaisali are barely at a distance of two kilometers as the crow flies, from the present village of Basokunda. It is not plausible that there should

be a kingdom ruled by the chief of another clan, so close to the capital of the Licchavis. Siddhartha belonged to the Jnatr (Naya or Nata) clan and was in marital relation with the Licchavis, his wife Trisala being the daughter of the Licchavi king Cetaka.

(ii) The present Kammana Chapra is at a distance of one kilometer only from the present Basokunda. It is not plausible that the Lord ended his day's journey merely at a distance of one kilometer.

(iii) There is no trace of any waterway between Basokunda and Kammana Chapra, nor is there any such trace in the neighbourhood of Basokunda.

(iv) The present village of Basokunda is a very small one, with a population of approximately two thousand. The whole village is almost plane with two tracts to low land called chauri It has no sign of any ancient habitation. The said uncultivated land is in the same level with the surrounding area and does not seem to have been uncultivated for more than few decades.

(v) If we suppose that the 'Kunda' part of this village name is the survivor of its counterpart in the ancient Ksatriya Kundagrama, we reach the conclusion that the distinguishing feature of the village name, namely 'Ksatriya' has been lost and the term 'Kunda' which was common to both Brahmana Kundagrama and Ksatriya Kundagrama has survived. But this is contrary to expectation. Generally in compound proper names ending in a common term the first distinguishing part should be retained and not the second member which is common to two or more.

So, there is case for re-thinking over the exact location of Lord Mahâvîra's birthplace.

We may start with the assumption that the epithet 'Vesaliya' for Lord Mahâvîra is not spurious because it has been found in two of the most ancient Jain canons viz. Suyagadam and Uttarajjhayana and it indicates that the Lord hailed from Vaisali or its surrounding area. Rsabha who hailed from Kosala has been called Kosaliya; in the same way, Lord Mahâvîra who hailed from Vaisali area has been called Vesaliya. We can not assume that he was born in the city of Vaisali because at several places in the Ardhamagadhi canons he has been said to be born in Ksatriya

Kundagrama. So we are laid to believe that he was born in Ksatriya Kundagrama which was situated in the vicinity of Vaisali.

Village-names can be depended upon because these carry the seeds of ancient tradition. In the neighbourhood of the ruins of Vaisali there are many villages which preserve their ancient names. Thus the present Baniya is the ancient Vanijyagrama. The present Kolhua is the ancient Kollaga Sannivesa. Vaisali itself has survived in the present villages called Basarh, Basara and Bakhara—all these names are derivatives from 'Vaisali' through the stages Vaisadi...Vaisada. .Basadha...Basada. .Basara...Bakhara.

In looking for a village bearing a name similar to the ancient Ksatriya Kundagrama, we should put more emphasis on the term 'Ksatriya' because it is the distinguishing feature of the proper name, the subsequent member of the compound being a common feature

Now, at a distance of approximately ten kilometers as the crow flies, in the north-east direction from the present ruins of Vaisali, there is a village called Chitri This may be the survivor of the ancient Ksatriya, Kundagrama This village has a more ancient look and it is much bigger than the present Basokunda Majority of inhabitants are Rajputs, the present counterpart of the ancient Ksatriyas. To the south east of this village there is another village called Bahilvara which is one of the biggest village of this locality. Majority of its population consists of Brahmanas. One is tempted to derive the name from 'Vahnivata' (sacrificial fire-place) which can well be associated with the ancient name Brahmana Kundagrama. Presence of Babhnagari (Babhananagari) township of the Brahmanas, beside the village further corroborates the assumption that Bahilvara-Babhanagari represents the ancient Brahmana Kundagrama.

To the east of the present village of Chitri, lies a lake at a distance of about two kilometers, nearly five kilometers in length and about two kilometers in width. This lake is called Narasana or Narasanda On the western bank of this lake, there is a patch of land, four to five acres in area, which is enclosed on all sides by high earthen embankments, at places seven to eight feet high. People of the locality testify that the present height of the embankment is much dwindled. The area is also surrounded by a

ditch on all sides save a fifteen feet wide path. The local people call it a Kila (fort), although, on the surface, there is no trace of bricks of potsherds etc. It is likely that the name Narasanda is the survivor of the ancient name Jnaytrisanda meaning the small forest or orchard owned by the people of the Jnatr clan. It has been said that Lord Mahâvîra took initiation in the Jnatrsanda Udyana (a garden in the orchard of the Jnatrs).

At a distance of nearly one kilometer, to the south-east of the village, Chitri, there is a river called Baya. On the village-side of the river, there is a rivulet called Jhajha running almost parallel to the river Baya which it joins at a distance of approximately five kilometers to the east of Chitri. River Baya has its source in a reservoir might be fed by the river Gandaka or Narayani. The Baya falls into the Ganga. May be it is an ancient navigation canal which served as a diagonal link between the two big rivers.

At a distance of about four kilometers from the present village of Chitri, there is a place on the bank of the Baya river called Jatakauli which might have been derived from Jnatrkuliya denoting a territory of principality of the Jnatrs.

The present Kolhua village identified with the ancient Kollaga Sannivesa, is at a distance of approximately ten kilometers from the said Narasanda lake. The present Kammana Chapra tentatively identified with the ancient Karmaragrama, too, is approximately at the same distance.

Thus prima-facie there is a case for regarding the cluster of villages around Chitri-Narasanda-Bahilvara-Babhanagari-Jatakauli as the principality of the Jnatrs and Chitri as the ancient Ksatriya-Kundagrama and the Narasanda lake area as the ancient Jnatrsanda.

The Chitri site for the location of the ancient Ksatriya-Kundagrama is preferable to Basokunda on the following grounds :

(i) It being situated at a distance of ten kilometers from Vaisali, rule of a chieftain at this place seems to be more plausible.

(ii) The tenatively located Karmargrama, the present Kammana Chapra, lies at a distance of approximately ten kilometers from Narasanda (Jnatrsanda); it is quite reasonable that Lord Mahâvîra should have ended his day's journey at this

place, having started it from the place of his initiation, namely the Jnatrsanda.

(iii) The two rivers or rather remains of navigation canals near this site corroborate the existence of a waterway beside Jnatrsanda and the Ksatriya Kundagrama.

(iv) In case of the Basokunda site there is an isolated case of phonetic similarity with Ksatriya Kundagrama whereas in case of the Chitri site presence of Narasanda strengthens Chitri's phonetic similarity with Ksatriya Kundagrama; Bahilvara-Babhanagari, corroborates it. Moreover, presence of Jatakauli in the neighbourhood of this site proves that the principality of the Jnatrs is represented by the present cluster of villages—Chitri, Bahilvara, Babhanagari, Jatakauli etc. and presumably the present river Baya marked its south western boundary.

All these facts establish at least one point that there is need for re-thinking over the location of Lord Mahâvîra's Birthplace.

References

1 Ayaranga—2, 15
2 Suyagadam—1, 2, Uttarajjhayana-6
3 Kalpasutra, life of Lord Mahâvîra
4 Malayagiri Vivaranam of Avasyaka-Churni

17

A NOTE ON LORD MAHÂVÎRA'S CLAN

—D.D. Malvania

In Pali texts *Nigantha Nathaputta* (or *Nataputta*) and in sanskrit Buddhist texts Nirgrantha (Nigrantha) Jnatiputra (Jnataputra) is used for Lord Mahâvîra (see Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary) In Jainagama texts also we have *Nayaputta*, *Nayasuya*, *Nayaputta*, Mahâvîra etc According to the comm of Samyuttanikaya '*Nata*' was the name of his father but Malalasekera says that *Nata* is the name of the clan, and most of the Jaina texts and commentators are unanimous in saying that *Nata* is the clan of the *Ksatriyas*

Recently Muni Nathmalji has opined that the Prakrit word *Naya* or *Nata* should be sanskritized as *Naga* [1] He may be correct to a certain extant as far as Prakrit word is concerned but when we see the word *Nata* or *Natha* used in Pali, there remains no possibility of sanskritizing it as *Naga*. Still we can keep this question of sanskritizing the word *Naya* open and find our some solution.

In Acaranga II we find '*Nayanam khattiyanam* (116) which shows that *Nayas*, were *Ksatriyas* This is corroborated by Kalpasutra (20) also

But in Acaranga I which is the earliest text of the Jaina Canon Lord Mahâvîra is called '*Mahana*' not once but four times at the end of all the four sub-sections of the ch. IX wherein escetic practices of the Lord are described—''एस विही अणुक्कन्तो माहणेण मईमया।

This statement may be right if we see the story in Bhagavatisutra (9 33 380) where the Lord says—देवाणंदा माहणी मम अम्मगा। अहन्नं देवाणदाए माहणीए अत्तए।'

Will it not be proper if we say that only after the introduction of the story of interchange of embryo the Lord was known as Ksatriya ? It can be assumed also that in order to validate the change of embryo this story in Bhagavati is inserted but that possibility is not there because in that case the question of relation of Trisala should arise which is not there.

Here we may mention the other possibility also. The Buddha and the Mahâvîra—both of them have propagated that only the right type of a *Bhiksu* can be called a *Brahmin* or *Mahana*. In this sense the Lord may have been called a *Mahana*.

Now let us see what information we get from the Jaina literature about the clan of the Lord and the *Naya kula*. It is certain that amongst the Vedic this *Naya kula* was not well known. Hence we find its mention very rare in the Vedic Puranas.[2]

And it is surprising to note that even in Jaina literature the Nayavamsa is given the prominent place in later times. An attempt is made to relate it with the famous Iksvakuvamsa or to separate it from the same This shows that the authors were not certain about the real position of the clan Naya

There are two clear traditions regarding the prominent *Vamsas* One is represented by Jaina Canonical literature and its Niryukti etc. and other is of the Jaina Puranas This will be clear from the following table

Avasyaka Niryukti (193)		Ugga Bhoga Rainna Khattiya				These constituted the retinue of Rsabha.		
Visesavasyaka (1610), 1829)		Ikkhaga		Naya,	Koravva		Harivamsa.	
Bhagavati (20 8)	"	"	"	x	"	"	"	x
(9 33)[3]	"	"	"	"	"	x	Bhada	
Sthananga (497)	"	"	x	"	"	"	x	
Prajnapana (104)	"	"	"	x	"	"	"	x
Kalpasutra (17)	"	"	"	"	x	x	"	
Brhatkalpa[4] (3265)	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	x
Puumacariya[5]		*Ikkhaga*	*Soma*	*Vijjahara*	*Vanara*	*Rakkhasa*	*Harivamsa*	

In the Avasyakaniryukti it is said that Ikkhaga Vamsa began

with Rsbha (181)[3]. So after Niryukti we find it mentioned as an important Vamsa in Jaina literature but question is—if it is a separate Vamsa, what is the relation between it and the Nayakula ? The authors are not unanimous about the answer. In Bhagavati etc. and even in Visesavasyaka as we have seen two are separately mentioned. But Umaswati and other commentators like Abhayadeva (ज्ञाता० 153) are of the opinion that Naya is a branch of the Ikkhaga Umasvati says[4] . जज्ञे ज्ञातेक्ष्वाकुषु सिद्धार्थनरेन्द्रकुलदीप: । तत्त्वार्थ-कारिका-11 The comm, on this is—'ज्ञाता नाम क्षत्रियविशेषा: तेषामपि विशेषसंज्ञा इक्ष्वाकव: It should be noted here that even तिलोयपण्णत्ति (4.550) mentions Naha Vamsa quite different from *Ikkhagakula*. It speaks of these Vamsas : Kuru, Naha, Ugga, Yadava and *Ikkhaku.* Avasyakacurni explains the Nata as—'णाता: नाम जे उसभसामिस्स ससणिज्जंगा ते णातवसा' p 245. Here we can see an attempt to relate the *Naya kula* with Rsabha.

It will be interesting to note the meaning given to *Ugga* etc by the Avasyakaniryukti—*Uggas were arakkhi*-guards, *Bhogas guru*—preceptors, Rainnas were *Vayamsa*—friends and the rest were Khattiyas (193). So the Ava. cu. follows the Ava N, when it includes relatives of Rsabha in the Nayas

Commentator Abhayadeva also follows him when he says ज्ञाता: इक्ष्वाकुवंशविशेषभूता: (Comm. on Nayadhammakaha, p. 153) Jinasena does not mention Naya or Jnata but mentions Siddhartha, the father of Lord Mahâvîra as belonging to the Iksvakus—(Harivamsapurana, 2, 4, 13), so also is done by the author of Cauppannamahapurisacariya (p. 271)

Observation of the above given table shows that Harivamsa was included in the list of the prominent Vamsas for the first time by Kalpsutra and it is quite clear that after the inclusion of Krsna story in the Jaina Canonical literature it was necessary to include the Harivamsa in the list. The Jaina puranas have it from the beginning.

One more striking fact is to be noted that the *Rainna* and the *Khattiyas* are removed from the list and the other ones are included This also is a deliberate attempt to follow the Vedic North Indian tradition instead of the tradition which was followed by the people of the Bihar-East India, as such practice is

not seen in the older Jaina text where we find—

''जे माहणे खत्तिय जायए वा तहुग्गपुत्ते तह लेच्छई वा।

जे पव्वईए परदत्तभोई गोत्ते न जे थब्भइ माणबद्धे।। Suyagada 1, 13.10

Here we see that the *mahana* and *Khattiya* are separately mentioned differentiating them from *Ugga* and *Leccha*. Same tradition is followed by Ava. Ni. having a minor change, but not giving the place of reputation to the Vedic Puranic Vamsas.

References

1 Anusandhana Patrika 1 1
2. प्राचीनचरित्रकोष (हिन्दी) पृ० 236
3 Uvavaia also has this list, see Bhagavati 9 33 382
4 In the concerned gatha number six is given so the comm counts Naya and Koravva as one
5 Dr Chandra A Critical study of Paumacariyam pp 199, 226
6 See also Vasudevahindi, p 161 Cauppannamahapurisacariya p 37 and Ava Cu, p 152 But according to Paumacariya Rsabha etc are of Ikkhagakula (94 8) and the same says that Ikkhagakula originated with the son of Bharata (5 9)
7 Can the word 'ज्ञात' be taken to mean famous ?

18

MAHÂVÎRA'S DYNASTY : NAGA OR JNATA

—Acharya Tulsi
—Muni Nathmal

(In this article rendered in English from a Hindi weekly "Jaina Bharati" the organ of *Jain Svetambar Terapanthi Mahasabha*, Calcutta No Year Acarya Tulsi, head of the Terapanth and Sponsor of the Anuvrat Movement and his learned disciple Muni Nathmal have thrown light on the possibility of Mahâvîra's having been a Naga instead of a Jnata prince. No mention is made anywhere in the history of ancient India by anyone about a clan named Jnata except on the anthority of the word "Nata" or "Naya" used for Mahâvîra's clan in the Agamic texts which in its Skt from is taken to be Jnata. But on the basis of the usages prevalent in Prakrit expecially that used in the Jaina cononical texts, in those period to which Mahâvîra is supposed to have belonged the authors gave shown that 'Jnata' is not the only skt from of Nata or Naya, that "Naga" is also a correct Skt form of these words Nagas have played a significant role in the history of India They were a non-Aryan and non-Vedic people and were connected with Jainism from immemorable past The present thesis on the clan of Mahâvîra is a very important contribution to Jainological studies and research and deserves attention of scholars all over the world —Editor)

The word "Nayaputta" is frequently used as a synonym of Lord Mahâvîra.[1] In the Buddist *Pitakas* he is called "Nigggantha Nataputta".[2] The skt form of both the words Nata and Naya is Jnata Hence he is called Jnataputra i.e one belonging to the Jnata clan. Now what does the word Jnata denote ? A person or a clan ? According the system of naming prevalent in those days the word "putra" (sutta = son) was simply put after the name of his father, mother or the clan We come across such names

Thavaccaputta in the jaina literature and Sariputta in the Buddhistic literature. These are after the names of their mothers. Siddhatthaputta is after the name of the father. "Naya" in any way is not connected with father or mother. It is the name of a clan. The Anuyogadvara Sutra gives a detailed exposition of the system of nomenclature. There we find Sthapana (based on family pride) as a Kind of nomenclature. In its exposition it has been stated that such names as Ugga, Bhoja, Khattiya, Ikkahaga, Nata and Koravva are clan names.[3] Mahâvîra's clan was Naya or Nata and for that he was known as Jnatraputra or Jnatasutta. Some modern scholars like Rahul Sankrityayana think "Jnatri" to be the correct Skt. form of Naya. On its basis they connect the clan of Mahâvîra with that of Jatharia or the land-plowers of Bihar.[4] But it is apparent that both the words Jnata and Jnatri are incorrect. The clan to which Mahâvîra belonged was *Naga*. The Skt form of Nayaputta may also be Nagaputta. The *curnis* are in Prakrit They contain the word Naya or Nata Occasionally Jnata is also found During the period of *Tikas* (commentaries) the mistake became more glaring. The majority of the commentators took the word Jnata. As far as our knowledge goes Abhayadeva Suri is the first commentator who has used Naga as the SKt. of Naya In his *vritti* to the Aupapatika (Sutra 14) he has explained Naya as "Jnata" or "Naga" "(*Nagavamsi*)" i.e. belonging to the Naga clan) [5] In his Vritti to the 27th Sutra of the same Agama he has given Nagavamsi as the principle meaning and Jnatavamsi as its mere alternative In Sutra-kritanga (2/1/9)[6]. We find Ikkhaga, Ikkhagaputta, Naya, Nayaputta, Koravva, Koravvaputta. One of the four manuscripts (written in 1581 V.S) of it used by us for the critical edition of the text given Naga and Nagaputta in place of Naya and Nayaputta. We don't find Jnata as a noted clan in the Indian history. But the Naga clan occupies a significant place. In the age of Mahâvîra Nagas lived in or around Vaisali

In a narration of the battle that took place between Cetaka, the leader of Vaisali republic (Ganarajya) and Ajatasatru Konika, a person named Varuna is mentioned.[7] One of his several adjectives is Naganattue i.e. grandson of the Naga.

According to Visnu Purana nine Naga Kings lived in *Padmavati*, Nagas had their dominion in Rajasthan also.[8] In

Kollaga settlement (Sannivesa) there was a Penance Chamber (Pausadhasala) of the Nagas.[9]

There is reference to Nayasanda or Nagavana (Garden of the Nagas) near the outskirts of Northern Ksatriya Kundagrama.[10] In the Jaina Agamas Naya (Naga) is mentioned along with the clan names of Ugra. Rajanya, Kaoravva and Ksatriya.[11] Great personages like the *Tithankaras* come of these.[12] There are references to the struggle of the Nagas and the Kauravvas. A Naga named Taksa killed PariKsita, his son Janamejaya avenged the murder of his father He drove the Nagas out of Taksasila and burnt many of them.[13] Thus the history of the Nagas is very old and famous and is available from the Northern and the Southern India. Reference to Naga Kings is also found in the history of Nepal.[14]

Iksvaku, Kasyapa and Naya

Mahâvîra belonged to the Iksvaku Dynasty. His *gotra* (family name) was Kasyapa Then how could he have been a Naya ? But the Nagas also originated from the Iksvaku Dynasty [15] Kasyapa is the family name of the Iskvakus According to the Mahabharata the Nagas descended from Kadru, one of the wives of the hermit.[16] In both the Mahabharata and the Visnu Purana wherever their present clan is mentioned it is Naga and wherever their traditional dynasty and family names are mentioned these are Iksvaku and Kasyapa respectively

Naga clan in the Jaina Tradition

The Nagas were of pre-Aryan stock. Their relation with the Jainism was very old. Nami and Vinami–sons of Kaccha and Mahakaccha followed lord Brisabha. They were imploring the Lord for a gift of a Kingdom but the Lord was silent At that time the Naga King came to pay homage to the Lord He taught them some occult lore and constructed for them 60 cities in the northern and 50 in the southern part of Mt. Baitadhya.[17]

The history of Nagapuja (snake-worship) almost belonged to that period.[18]

According to Acharya Ksitimohan Sen the practice of worship is non-Vedic. He writes "Many people believe that practice of worship is also Vedic The truth is that the word is not

there at all. Its origin is to be found in the non-Vedic languages."[19] Some scholars say that Lord Mahâvîra revolted against the Vedic ritual of *Yajna*. He was born and brought up in a separate tradition called *shramana* Religion which was quite distinct from the Brahmanical one. That he opposed the Vedic rituals and uninstructed penances was not due to any revolt but that was his heritage. If we see him as a scion of the Naga dynasty our present misconception will disappear. The words like *Tirthankara* are clear proofs that Mahâvîra belonged to a non-Vedic clan. In the words of Aharya Ksitimohan Sen "The meeting place of the Vedic Aryans was *yajna* and that of the non-Vedic one's *Tirtha* The word "*Tirtha*" is non-Vedic. That is why the anti-Vedic ideologies are called the *Tairthikas* (i e. belonging to the Tirthas) (Karanda Vyuha 10-62) [20]

Lord Mahâvîra was foremost amongst the Reachers of Nirvana.[21] The Doctrine of Nirvana belongs to the Shramanic tradition Hence the adjective makes him distinct from the Brahmanical tradition This may be said of Lord Buddha. His clan was also influenced by Lord Parshva. Many scholars like Dr. Stevenson have thrown light on the subject In opposing the Vedic rituals and propounding the doctrine of Ahimsa-non-violence both of them represented the same one tradition While Buddha belonged to the Sakya clan Mahâvîra belonged to the Nagas these Naga or Nayas had a very good relation with Jainism from old and they followed the Lord Parshva.

The Enigma of Naya and Naga

If Mahâvîra is regarded to be a Naga then how one can use Naya or Nata for him? The sKt form of Naya may be Naga but that of Nata seems to be Jnata only. This confounds the mind at first but a perusal of the Agamic usages dispels that doubt. Finally we see substitution of "ta" for some letters profusely, e.g. :

Ga—	(1) Patto Vaga	Patto vata	(Sthan. 128)
Ja—	(2) Kanharaji	Kanharati	(Sthan. 389)
O—	(3) Savvao	Savvato	(Sthan. 389)
Da—	(4) Padesia	Patesita	(Sthan. 593)
Ya—	(5) Rasayane	Rasatane	(Sthan. 611)
Ya—	(6) Sayam	Satam	(Sthan. 113)

There are only a few examples. In the Agamic texts written

between 15th and 18th century "ta" is used for vowels such as a, a, i, u, e, o, and the 10 consonants. There is no wonder therefore 'Naga' becoming Nata or Naya by substitution of "ta" for 'ga' and 'Ya' for 'ta' respectively We are also not bound to make nata as Jnata for there is ta in Nata. A close study of the above mentioned facts will make it clear that Lord Mahâvîra was a Nagaputra (belonging to Naga clan) and not Jnataputra (belonging to Jnatra dynasty).

References

1 Acaranga, 1/9/47 Sutrakritanga, 1/6/24, Dasa Vaikalika Sutra, 5/2/51, Uttaradhyayana sutra, 6/17
2. Dighanikaya Samanjaphala Suttra, 18/21, Vinaya Pitaka Mahavagga, pp 242
3 Anuyogadvara Sutra, 130
Se Kim tam Kula name ? ugge bhoge, rainne, khattiye, ikkhage, nate, Koravve
4 Mahâvîra Vardhamana, pp 16
5 Aupapatika Vritti, Patra 50
Ugga pavvaiya bhogapavvaiya rainnanaya, Koravva Khattiya pavvaiya Jnatah Iksvakuvamsa vises-abhutah Naga Va Nagavamsa prasutah
6 Ibid Patra 110
Kvacit patyate-ikkhaga, naya, Koravva-nayanti nagavamsya Va jnatavamsya va
7 Rajaputane Ka Itihasa, Ist Vol pp 230-32
8 Bhagavati, 7/9
9 Upasakadasa, 1/67
10 Acaranga, 2/15
11 Aupapatika Sutra 14/27, Anuyogadvara sutra, 130
12 Avasyaka Niryukti Bhasya 50 patra 255
Uggakuda Bhogakhattiya Kulesu ikkhaga naya Koravve/harivamse ya visale jayanti tahim purisa siha
13 Bharatiya Itihasa Ki Ruparekha, pp 523
14 The History of Nepal, pp 70-174
15 Bhagavana Parsvanatha, Vol 1, pp 150
16 (a) Mahabharata, Adiparva Astika parva, 16/8
Harsada pratimam pritim prapatuh sma varastriyou vabre Kadru sutan nagan sahasram tulya varcasah
(b) Visnupurana, 1/21/19-21
17 Avasyaka Niryukti 340
Nami vinasina jayuna nagindo vejjadana veyatthe/uttara dahina sedhi satthi pannasa nagaraim
18 Ibid 218
Jannanagayana puyatto
19 Bharatavarsa mem Jatibheda, pp 77
20 Ibid, pp 75
21 Sutrakritanga Sutra, 1/6/21
Nivvanavadiniha nayaputte

19

THE NATIVITY OF MAHÂVÎRA : A DISCUSSION*

—Asis Sen

After the erudite articles and commentaries of Commaraswamy[1], Jacobi[2], Brown[3], Buhler[4], Smith[5] and others on the nativity of the Lord Mahâvîra very little has been left for further discussion These scholars have examined every aspect of the legend and the relative illustrations, and thrown light from all possible angles on the symbolism associated with the story of the brith of the Saviour. Coomaraswamy in his article, referred to above, has pointed out that the miraculous legend was in no way a contemporary Jaina invention and its 'ultimate explanation can only be found in the Vedic metaphysical tradition and or cognate traditions'. Independently, Buhler also expresses the same view after being taught by 'Mathura discoveries that Indian art was not sectarian', and that its symbolic and conventional devices have been drawn up from a common storehouse. This storehouse, no doubt, was that of archetypal ideas common to every human psyche in its subconscious zone collected at the stage of the origin of consciousness. These archetypal convictions are found to have repeatedly recurred in the imagination of the authors of different ages to make them vaguely infuse with their new creations. Thus, the ultimate explanation of these symbolic illustrations appear not to be embedded in the Vedic metaphysical or cognate traditions but in the conception of more archaic, may be of palaeolithic, or eve of the earlier stage of human intellect. Coomaraswamy has cited how 'with an almost literal fidelity' the conception of dual birth of the conqueror has been borrowd by the Jainas from the

* The Visva Bharati Quarterly, Vol 19, 1954

Rgvedic hymns I, 113, 1-3, where Night 'when she hath conceived for the Sun's quickening yields the place of birth (yoni) to Dawn' and I, 124, 8, where 'sister to more excellent sister yields the place of birth (yoni)[6]'. He has also added the analogous legend of dual birth from the Bhagavata Purana [The story of the transference of Vasudeva Samkarsana from the womb of Devaki to that of Rohini] pointing out that these stories appear to have been borrowed from one or the other or a congnate source. Coomaraswamy has also added some other stories referring to the foster-mothers of some heroes[7], but these are not absolutely identical with the former although there is an obvious suggestion of the very same idea The stories of dual birth, in fact, are not evidence of scriptural transference but upsurge of primordial ideas from the subconscious psyche to the conscious level with additions of later complexity. For, have we not noticed in the above Rgvedic hymns though composed in an age when human intellect had recorded considerable advancement retain the archetypal idea of conception, that Night impregnates herself by withdrawing the Sun into her womb ? She takes her offspring, the Sun, back through death (P1 I) like the Mother-earth which retakes the dead into the grave Such thought induced the palaeolithic people to cover their dead bodies with redochre to impart a look like the setting sun with the hope of their resurrection. In this aspect, neither Night nor the Mother-earth was considered to be cordial for both were associated with death[8]. But the transference of the Sun from the womb of Night to that of the more excellent sister (the benign aspect of her counterpart) Dawn, who yields (the Sun) the place of birth (yoni) points to very very elementary metaphysical conception of entrance and exit through the place of birth (yoni) for a new life. It was thus the reminiscence of the belief of the age when requirement of the male counterpart was not at all realised in connection with the phenomenon of birth in human or animal world[9] and, naturally, it has no reflection in the supernatural realm This puerile idea even in a very late period was found to have been readjusted with later advanced understanding. In the Srimat Bhagavata, we find, the Primeval Person enters the womb

of the mother Aditi along with the vital fluid of Kasyapa (Prajapati) when she contemplated the Almighty as centred in her husband at the time of their union.[10]

In the legend of the Nativity of the Jina[11], we find Devananda who conceived the conqueror, was incapable for parturition. Now, what was the reason—was it because she represented the dark side of the Great Mother or Night ? Was her pregnancy caused by the entry of the Saviour into her womb covertly suggested to be an unkind Mother[12] and she was thus made unfit for the act of delivery ? An explanation has been put forward by the myth maker by describing her a Brahmin of low social status and in the *Kalpa Sutra*, 19, we find Arhats, etc., in the past, present and future, descend in (i.e. take the form of an embryo in the womb of a woman belonging to) low families etc. but they are never brought forth by birth from such a womb.[13] In another Rigvedic myth, we similarly trace that Indra was conceived by an unkind mother whom Sayana describes as Rakshasi. In *Rigveda*[14] Aditi is found to have reiterated that she is the real mother of Indra and says that 'I cast thee (Indra) from me, mine—thy youthful mother; thee mine own off spring, Kusava hath swallowed', i.e., whom Kusava hath conceived[15]. The particular story which was associated with the birth of Indra appears to have been lost. the puerile ideas which produce such stories remain dormant in our sub-conscious psyche, but are occasionally found to have emerged into the conscious level under the veil of some new legends agreeable to the taste and inclination of the contemporary age. In the Christian mythology and art, Pieta, the Madonna, is represented as 'holding in her lap the dead Jesus, the child of death, who has returned to her'.[16] [pl. 2] Like Night [pl.1], she, the Eternal Mother has intaken in embryonic shape [to heaven] 'the child of death' who is stated to have been brought earlier to the womb of Mary, the temporal but benign aspect of the Madonna, to bring him forth by birth. Of course, the idea of eternal mother was denied in the male monotheistic philosophy of Christianity which turns 'the child of death' into the 'Son of God' and the Eternal Mother as the mortal woman Mary who was treated merely as receptacle of the Holy Spirit.[17]

II

Let us now probe into the matter which had confused Dr. Buhler to interpret the inscription '*bhagaba Nemeso*' found on a broken slab at Mathura [pl. 3, see cover] and which the great scholar has ingeniously proved to be the representation of the Nativity of Lord Mahâvîra. Buhler has critically gone through the Jaina texts and very minutely observed the available representations of the story found at Mathura. He identifies divine (*Bhagava*) Nameso with Harinegamesi to Kalpasutra, the commander of the foot-troops of Indra and god Naigameshin of the *Nemina-thacharita* and the demon Naigamesha and Nejamesha of the *Gribya Sutra* and the *medical Samhitas*. Thereafter, he asserts that this deity/demi god or demon Naigmesha, identical with Brahmanical deity Naigameya, a son or companion of the war-god Skanda, appears to be a goat-headed therianthropomorphic deity whom the *Mahabharata* describes as 'Chagavaktra' or goat-faced He further states that as the note to the *Kalpasutra* (in connection with Harinegamesi) suggests, 'the Negamesi of Hari', i e., 'Negamesi is the servant of Indra' It was probably through a wrong impression that the deity has been represented in the mediaeval pictures as a man with the head of an antelope (ancient illustrated copy of *Kalpasutra* by Jacobi).[18] He adds that the early Brahmanical authors appear to have made a similar mistake by describing the deity as ramheaded on account of seeming connection of the name (of the deity) with *mesha*, or ram. Buhler also observes that the lithographs published in the *Arch. Sev Reports* Vol. XX plate IV, 2-5 by Sir A Cunningham of the four mutilated statues now preserved in the Mathura museum were meant to represent the nativity of Mahâvîra and disagress with Cunningham that the two male figures who are found to be engaged in exchanging the embryos are representations of goat-headed diety, not an ox-headed one as assumed by Cunningham So far as representations are concerned, the observation of Buhler appears to be a correct one But there still remains a scope to examine critically whether it was only the phonetic similarity which induced the Brahmanical writers to represent the deity as

ram-headed and the mediaeval Jaina authors, to describe the deity as gazelle-headed. At the same time, we should try to understand properly whether the suggestion of Cunningham to identify the two statues as ox-headed figures was really an outcome of his intuitive knowledge or merely the result of his wrong observation.

In the history of religion, it is apparent that in spite of attribution of immortality, no deity was found to retain his or her dominance over their devotees for a long period. Either the deity had to vacate his or her position for a new one or to extract out of himself or herself new forms, agreeable to the taste of new generations. In the polytheistic religion, the process was fast and continuous, but such tendency, though general of Devaraja Indra according to the Jaina tradition, distinctly reminds us either of the goat-headed Daksa-Prajapati or the Chagavaktra (goat-faced) companion of Skanda-Karttikeya of the Hindu mythology, and one of the various names of Karttikeya is Naigameya according to early and late lexicons'. J. N Banerjea, Development of Hindu Iconography, Calcutta, 1956, p. 562 and pp. 363 and 367. slow, was also traceable even in the monotheistic belief where rigorous guard was always kept against any such modifications. In Christian religion, for example, God is practically replaced by his own son, Christ, who assumes all the authroity of the former. However, if ordinance could have been set aside, Christ, would have had to vacate his place to the Virgin, whose Roman Catholic Votaries not only attribute to her all qualities of divinity but also secured a seat for her in Heaven by the side of the Holly Trinity.[19] (pl. 4).

In India, a continuous replacement of new godheads was a constant feature in all religious systems whether orthodox or heterodox. Replacement of Varuna by Indra, Indra by Brahma, Brahma by Visnu or Siva and the last two by their human avataras may be noted in connection with the Vedic Brahmanical religion. They were found to assume the different roles to arouse devotional feelings according to the varying need of different generations. In Buddhism, the same urge produced divine or Dhyani Buddhas, the mental creation of Adi Buddha, which in their turn produced the Bodhisattvas and their female

counterparts together with hosts of minor deities. But an interesting point was that though these new godheads inherited qualities of the predecessors and had their own new attributes, they were occasionally found to have failed in performing the basic functions of a god and some of the older original gods had to be summoned in that particular situation. This sometimes helped the older gods to survive by reasserting their position amidst the new ones. The fact emerges therefore, that our subconscious mind never allows any advancement of thought dissociated from the basic symbolic form and intrudes at the points of its break with new legends to maintain the link with its origin Thus Krisna, whose divinity was beyond any question (in the *Neminathacharita* referred to by Buhler[20]), had to seek help from Naigameshin 'to obtain from Satyabhama, a son equal to Pradyuman in luck and good qualities.' Who was this Naigameshin ? Was he not the primeaval male animal (Bovine) divinity which in course of evolution took the form of the male anthropomorphic godhead, Siva on the one hand and Rishabhanatha on the other ? Was not his presence in this particular situation proof enough that he was the male *par excellence*, (the bull), the consort of the Great Mother, and was always seen to appear in the dreams of the mothers of all Tirthankaras ? In fact, after being replaced by advanced type of anthropomorphic godheads, he was pushed behind the lime-light, continuing for ever to remain in the subconscious mind with full vigour and was ultimately found to have emerged at the critical moment to assist the advanced type of divinity, as the legend of the nativity of the Lord Mahâvîra shows. In the *Kalpa Sutra* 16-22, we find that though the Tirthankaras are 'the highest of the world, the guides of the world, the benefactors of the world', 'the givers of safety', 'the givers of shelter', 'the givers of life', 'the universal emperors of best law' and are thought to have reached the happy, stable, unstained, infinite, unperishable, undecaying place' they may 'take the form of an embryo in the womb of a woman belonging to low families' due to undestroyable Karman In addition, they had to depend upon Sakra, a much inferior divinity, for being removed from 'such like low, mean etc., families'. But it is interesting that to execute the

work, Sakra had again to depend upon a still earlier divinity, who by that time had been pushed back to the stage of a demigod or demon although retaining still the power which neither Sakra nor Mahâvîra possessed. Therefore, it was he who had to be summoned at the time of crisis. The demigod Naigameshin as represented on the stone slab found at Mathura may be a goat-headed deity as suggested by Buhler. But this therianthropomorphic godhead had also variant forms, bull-headed, gazelle-headed and ram-headed. For, all male harbivorous animals were found to have assumed the role of the consort of the Great Mother in the beliefs of ancient ethnic groups according to their individual choice. Gradually these animals fused into a composite one due to later racial admixture of the ethnic groups and was metamorphosed from a Zoomorphic to a therianthoropomorphic and finally to an anthropomorphic divinity [21] Thus Siva who has been evolved out of a bovine divinity also bears epithets, Saranganatha, the lord of the gazelle or antelope and Medrajah. i.e., born of a ram. The association of the bull with the human birth of Buddha and an antelope as one of his emblems found engraved on this throne are known facts.

Turning our attention of the four multilated statues referred to before (now in the museum at Mathura) representing the same theme carved on the fragmentary stone slab under discussion, it may be pointed out that Cunningham admits his inability to trace out the clue to the animal-headed figures But their connection with the naked female figures on the one hand and their children on the other led him tc believe the therianthropomorphic figures to be the representations of the 'Ox-headed' deity (i e , the male *par excellence*). Thus alike several other instances, in the present case also, Cunningham's intuitive sense surprisingly proved to be basically correct, though in later period, we notice that in formation of male divinity the contribution of other male herbivorous animals was of no less importance. The complex origin of the divinity/demon not only confused the early Brahmanical and the mediaeval Jaina authors but at the same time it has developed a scope of disputation among modern scholars.

References

1. A K Commaraswamy 'The Conqueror's Life in Jaina Painting Explicitur Redectio Haec Artis and Theogian', *Journal of Oriental Society of Indian, Art* Vol III, No 2, Dec 1935.
2 H Jacobi, *Sacred Books of the East* (S B.E.), Vol XXII
3 WN Brown, *Miniature Paintings of the Jaina Kalpasutra* Washington, Smithsonian Institution, 1934
4 G Buhler, 'Specimens of Jaina Sculptures from Mathura' *Epigraphia India*, Vol II, pp ?11-318
5 V Smith, *Jaina Stupas and Other Antiquities from Mathura*, Indological Book House, Varanasi, 2nd Ed , 1969
6 Coomaraswamy, Op Cit , p 132
7 *Ibid* , pp 131f
8 A Sen 'The Facial Transformation of the Great Mother' *The Visva-Bharati Quarterly*, Vol 40, No 4, pp 345 ff
9 *Ibid* , pp 353 ff
10 *Op Cit* , VIII, 17, 21-28
11 'When Indra became aware that Mahâvîra had taken the from of an embryo in the Brahmani Devananda's body, he paid his reverence to the Arhat that was to be born It then occurred to him that an Arhat ought not to be born in a low Brahmanical family, but only in a noble royal race, and that it was and always had been the duty of the reigning Indra to transfer the embryo, in case through the influence of his Karman as Arhat had descended into the body of a female of the Brahmana caste In order to fulfil this duty Indra directed Harinegamesi, the divine commander of infantry, to transfer Mahâvîra from the body of Devananda to Trisala, a lady of the Jnatri family of Ksatriyas who was also with child Harinegamesi then repaired first to the Brahmanical quarter of Kundagrama, took Mahâvîra from Devenanda, cleansing him from all impurity, and carried him carefully in his folded hands to the Kshatriya quarter of the same town There he took Trisalas embryo from her, likewise duly cleansing it and put Mahâvîra in its place Next, he returned to Devananda and placed Trisalas child in her body During these operations the two ladies and their attendants lay in deep magic sleep Finally, the deity returned to Indra's abode and reported him that his orders had been carried out ` Jacobi, *Op Cit* , pp 223 ff
12 C G Jung, *Symbols of transformation*, Vol II (Tr by R FC Hull), New York, 1956 p 328
13 There is another Jaina legend, though possibly of a very late origin, which explains the transfer of Mahâvîra's embryo The story goes like this . 'In a previous incarnation Devananda and Trisala had been sisters-in-law, and Devananda had taken advantage of their intimacy to steal a priceless jewel from Trisala , and so, by the automatic working of the law of Karma, which invariably makes the punishment fit the crime, her jewel of a son was removed from her and given to the woman she had wronged ' S Stevenson, (Mrs), *The Heart of Jainism*, First Indian edition, 1970, p 47
14 *Op Cit* IV 18, 8
15 A Sen *Op Cit* , p 358 f and *Animal Motifs in Ancient Indian Art*, Calcutta, 1972, p
16 E Neumann *The Great Mother* (Tr by R Manhiem) New York, 1954, p 222

[Pita < Pietas (Roman Pagan deity). Pietas existed in private worship from very early times. Strictly speaking, she represented ideal relation between parents and children but later on represented the dark side of the Mother.]

17 A Sen, 'The Facial Transformation of the Great Mother', p. 361f

18. G. Buhler, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 315 f.
'The very interesting image-type of Harinegamesi or Naigamesa, a

19 The bodily assumption of Mary into heaven was defined as a dogma of the Catholic faith, C G. Jung, *Psychology and Religion · West and East*, (Tr by R.F.C Hull), London, 1958.
'Although the assumption of Mary is of fundamental significance, it was not the first case of this kind. Enoch and Elijah were taken up to heaven with their bodies and many holy men rose from their graves when Christ died' *Ibid.*, p 171 (Foot-note No 14)

20. Buhler, *Op*, *Cit.*, p 315

21 A Sen *Animal Motifs in Ancient Indian* Art, pp 59 122 f
I express my thanks to Dr Asoke Majumdar who has gone through my article critically and has given me some valuable suggestions, e.g , the Jaina legend connected with Mahâvira's birth referred to by Mrs Stevenson (Foot-note no 13) and the observation of Prof J N Banerjea on Naigamesa (Foot Note No 18) He has also supplied me with the following note on Dr Banerjea's statement 'The word 'Naigameya' is not given in the Amara or Abhidhanchintamani The Mbh (Gita Press ed Adi, 66 24 and cr ed, 60 24) states that Kartikeya had three brothers one of whom was called Anala However, the Mbh (Salya, Gita Press, 44 37 Cr. ed. 43 37) states that Skanda appeared in four forms one of which was called 'Naigameya'

20

LOCATION OF THE PLACE OF ENLIGHTENMENT OF LORD MAHÂVÎRA*

—Kanhaiya Lal Saraogi

It is universally agreed and believed by all the sects of the Jainas that the last Tirthankara Lord Mahâvîra attained full knowledge at Jrimbhikagama on the Northern bank of the river Rijukulva or Rijubelika under a sala tree on Vaisakha Sukla 10 in the afternoon. Regarding the further movements etc of the Lord we find two different stories. The Digambaras say that after attaining Kaivalva or becoming all knowing Lord Mahâvîra going from place to place ultimately reached Vipula Hill in Rajgir. He kept silence all the way and did not preach of give any discourse because, according to them (the Digambaras) a Tirthankara will not speak unless and until a Ganadhara or a learned disciple is present there.

Indira, the king of god, found out a very learned Brahmana, Gautama Indrabhuti, and brought him near the Lord so that He might speak This Indrabhuti became the first follower and disciple of Lord Mahâvîra and after he was admitted to the Order, the Lord's super-human dialogues started This happened on the 1st day of Sravan.

The Svetambara story is a bit different. It tells us that the Lord after passing the 12th rainy season of his ascetic life at Champa (near Bhagalpur) and passing through Jrimbhikagama. Medhia Chhammani etc. had travelled to Pava and thence again to Jrimbhikagama. At Jrimbhikagama He sat in meditation under a Sala tree in the field of one Syamaka, not very far from the old

---

* Jaina Antiquary, Vol XXXI, No. 2, page 28-31.

and dilapidated Vyavrit Chaitya on the northern bank of the river Rijukulya He was undertaking the two days fast. It was in the afternoon, when the shadows had moved towards the western horizon, that He attained full knowledge and following the tradition. He waited there for a while and started His preaching. But as there was no human being present at the time, no one took the vow of abstention. The Lord then perceived in His vision that a rich Brahmana Somila was celebrating a great Yajna at Pava, in which the top ranking learned persons from different places were participating. The Lord thought it to be highly opportune and fruitful to go there and start His preaching.

He immediately walked on to Pava, which was 12 Yojanas away from Jrimbhikagama (according to calculation as given in the BHAGAVATI SUTRA 6/7, 12 Yojanas will be equal to 54 or 55 miles A Samavasaran (religious discourse pavilion) was got erected there the next day. People flocked there to hear Him and have His darsana. Indrabhuti Gautama, one of the participants in the Yajna also came to know of the arrival of Lord Mahâvîra, and taking Him to be a hypocrite, went to out-wit Him in discussions. But lo ! he became a follower of Lord Mahâvîra along with all his 500 disciples Another ten topmost Brahamanas and their disciples also followed suit The Lord waited there for some days more and then went to Rajagriha, where he passed the 13th rainy season (Kalpasutra 120)

The aim of our thesis is to locate Jrimbhikagama Before pursuing our points, we would like to refer to some of the previous assumptions regarding the location of the above-mentioned place. It will be also important to say here that hitherto there has been a wrong and unfounded belief that almost all the sacred Jain places in Bihar lie in southern Bihar, i.e. south of the river Ganges. The researches regarding end locations of Vaishali as the birth place of Lord Mahâvîra in the old Muzaffarpur district of North Bihar and Pavanagar as the place of the Nirvana of Lord at Sathiaon in the Deoria district of U.P. in recent years, have practically put an end to the old belief. (See an Early History of Vaisali by Dr. Yogendra Mishra, Vaisali by the Late Muni Vijaendra Suriji and our PAVA SAMIKSHA, the last two works in Hindi).

Present Jharia, Jamui, Jambhi, Jogram (Burdwan) etc. are among the places believed to be the possible sites where Lord Mahâvîra got full-knowledge. The Barakar river is presumed to be the old Rijubalika. Some scholars have laboured at prove the Poonpoon, the Aji or the Kamsa etc. to be the Rijubalika. In our opinion none of these assumptions has got any substance or solid grounds As we have already seen above, the Lord travelled 12 yojanas from Jrimbhikagama to reach Pava. None of the places named above is at the distance of 12 Yojanas either from Pavapuri (Nalanda district) or Pavanagar (Deoria district). Besides the names of the rivers too have no similarity with Rijubalika or Rijukulya. So no one among the aforesaid places can be accepted to be Jrimbhikagama

We have set out on a journey to explore the real place by sticking closely and carefully to the versons of the Jain literature. Let us also follow the path Lord Mahâvîra had travelled after the completion of the 12th rainy-season. He had started from Champa and moved westward, crossing the Ganges somewhere near Sonepur, at a point west of the river Gandaka. He arrived at Jrimbhikagama and proceeded further north-west to Medhiya in our opinion Manjha; then according to us to Chhammani i.e Chhitauli and reached Pavanagar (Sathison-Fazilnagar). He then returned to Jrimbhikagama and again went to Pava etc.

This route naturally suggests that Jrimbhika must be somewhere to the south east of Pava and north west of Champa, at a distance of 54-55 miles from Pava. This place is quite easy to be located in the district of Siwan or Saran. In our opinion Jhanjhwa is the ancient Jrimbhikagrama.

A small rivulet flows by the side of Jhanjhwa towards the south-east. It might have its origin somewhere in the northern parts of the eastern U.P. In Buddhist scripture we find mention of a river by the name of Kulya flowing six miles south-east Kushinagar. This is extinct now We presume this to be the river Rijukulya which before it became dead or extinct, flowed through Jhanjhwa. It might have been a branch of the river Narayani Gandaki flowing there

The most important and decisive point is the presence of a sala tree at Jrimbhikagama. We all know that sala trees are found

in north-eastern U.P., Nepal and north Bihar etc. The belt starting from the district of Gorakhpur to Tirhut Division, between the Himalayas and the Ganges, has been the producing area of sala trees. Sala trees are totally absent in the regions south of the Ganges. We do not find any mention of presence of a sala tree in any one of the scriputres, in the said area. Hence Jrimbhikagama can never be spotted anywhere either in south Bihar or in West Bengal.

Four factors will determine the genuineness of the location of Jrimbhika, viz. (i) the name of the place should resemble the name of Jrimbhika, (ii) there must be a river or river-bed whose name should resemble the name of Rijukulya (iii) the place must be in a sala growing belt, and (iv) the place must be at a distance of 12 Yojanas about 54-55 miles from Pavanagar. Jhanjhwa fulfils all these conditions. Hence our location of Jrimbhika at the present day Jhanjhwa is fully justified and its authenticity is proved beyond all doubts.

Jhanjhwa is on the metaled road running from Gopalganj to Barauni in the old district of Saran in Bihar. The road joins the National Highway no. 28 connecting Lucknow with Assam. The nearest railway Station (about 4 miles) is Sidhwalia on the Chapra-Siwan loop line of N.E. Railway. Buses also ply between Chapra and Jhanjhwa.

21

LORD Mahâvîra : A REVOLUTIONARY*

—Muni Dulaharaj

INTRODUCTION

Mahâvîra's life is an embodiment of love and compassion. He was the conscience of immortal India. He reached the pinnacle of spiritual awakening and preached what he realised. He never preached anything new, but accelerated the momentum of truth prevailing and called upon the forces of the past, lying in stupor, for setting the tone. Non-violence became manifest in him and he raised a clarion call for unity of all good forces to wage war against evils. He succeeded in his attempts.

Lord Mahâvîra appeared as a meteor in the Indian Firmament, flashed a beam of light, rent the darkness of ignorance and superstition of the people He was a great prophet, the twenty-fourth Tirthankar of the Jains. He preached what then was called Nirgrantha religion, which in later centuries assumed the name of Jainism.

It is accepted by all historians that Jain relegion has a very hoary past. It is not the off shoot of any other religion, but has an independent existence. The twenty-four Tirthankaras were born in India, preached the gospel of non-violence and truth, enriched the culture of India and infused in people the love for all living beings without any distinction Mahâvîra the twenty-fourth leader reformed the old and formulated new religious norms and principles to suit the time and space. He was not the founder of Jain religion, as some believe, but redical changes.

Lord Mahâvîra : His Life

* Lord Mahâvîra Life and Teachings, 1970

King Chetaka was the chief of Vaishali Federal Republic. He had seven daughters and one sister named Trishala. She was married Siddartha chief of a unit of Vaishali Federal Republic. Once his wife, Trishala, had fourteen dreams. Immediately she asked her husband to invite psyiologist to interpret the dreams. After scrutinizing the contents of the dreams, they calculated that a great soul would take birth in the womb of Trishala. "That soul will reach the back of perfection of self-realisation and will be the torch bearer of the whole world. He will be the harbinger of peace and bestower of happiness to the worried masses. He will undergo severe mental tribulations and physical hardships with equanimity of mind and finally achieve enlightenment. He will be the loadstone of all hearts and loadstar of all eyes even at home He will become atreclus who will lead the religious world to perfection and create a harmonious atmosphere. On the whole, he will be the hero of the human race, in whom love for living beings; without any discrimination, will reach its pinnacle. Though a man in flesh and blood, his divinity will be unrivalled." they said

Mahâvîra was born in 599 B C. His father and mother were very much delighted at his birth He bore three names. They called him Vardhamana, because from the date he was conceived by Trishala, the wealth, power and prosperity of the kingdom were steadily improving. He was called Mahâvîra because he had subdued his external as well as his internal foes. He was also called Gnyataputra or Nagaputra, because he belonged to the Naga Dynasty

From very early days of childhood, Lord Mahâvîra evinced extraordinary qualities which distinguished him later. As a young man, he was the most popular and intelligent amongst his companions and was their acknowledged leader. Once he was playing with his class-mates under a banyan tree. All were fully engrossed in the game. A black snake came out from the hollow of the tree. Everyone except Mahâvîra ran away in fear. He was so dauntless and courageous that he confronted it boldly. When the serpent attacked him, he stood still and clam. Suddenly he caught it by its tail and flung it away after rotating it violently in the sky. Thus he relieved his friends from fear.

At the age of 28, Mahàvîra lost his father and mother. He determined to renounce the world and lead the life of a mendicant, but his elder brother Nandivardhana, peronaded him to remain at home for another two years. He accepted his brother's advice and became an ascetic at the age of thirty.

According to Jain tradition, self-enlightened persons are never initiated by anyone. They initiate themselves. Mahâvîra acquired super-psychic knowledge which is only acquired by those who dedicate their whole life to the realisation of truth, practise self-control and are on the way to eradicated all their bondages.

At first he was alone. He wandered in the forests and lived there for days together, completely engrossed in deep meditation and concentration. For twelve years and six months he led a life of severe hardships and bore all the tortures with equilibrium of mind. At last, one fine morning, while seated in meditation, a light flashed in him; he became omniscient Now nothing was concealed from him. His knowledge was straight and infallible He attained his goal. We shall now view him in different phases of Sadhka and Meditation.

Meditation means direct realisation of the soul-force Mind and the senses are the two means of our knowledge. They always hanker after the objects Meditation takes them to the inner sphere of the soul, where the tank of bliss is full to the brim This introspection reveals the truth in its totality

Mahâvîra was a man of deep meditation. In his Sadhana of twelve and a half year, it is related, he hardly slept far an hour. He was fully immersed in meditation day and night He selected lonely places for meditation. There, standing straight, stretching his hands up skyward, he meditated for days together, without interruption. While thus standing in meditation he never cared for his body, but stood all hardships unperturbed. It is a fact that one who meditates and lives deep into the inner ocean of the soul, knows no inflictions of the body. He becomes one with the consciousness He feels no pangs of hunger and thirst. He gets full nourishment from the elixir of meditation. In effect, he becomes one with the pervasive consciousness.

Mahâvîra withstood all the physical hardships which

confronted him in his Sadhana only through meditation and turned them into pleasures.

Mahâvîra : A Man of Interpidity of valour

Mahâvîra was literally a great warrior because his life was ever burning with great enthusiasm and self-exertion. he said : "Keep a flame, keep awake; to stay extinct, to lie in torpor is sin. Keep burning so that the sparks of the fire scintillate the whole atmosphere and turn the darkness into light."

Mahâvîra's light kept burning till the last. He said: "Non-violence is the source of spiritual strength. To bear all the trials and tribulations is the royal path to emancipation. These two principles are intertwined. One who does not know how to endure strain totters and falls before the first whiff of adversity, is a coward. He can never be an apostle of Non-violence despises cowardice."

Mahâvîra was a rock in the ocean, tranquil amid the raging billows of mental pangs and physical hardships. He was famous for his intensive penances and severe austerities. After attaining enlightenment, he once went to Lada region. As he entered the town, people were surprised to see this strange figure. The boys flocked and pelted stones at him. All were simmering with excitement. They led rabid dogs after him. Filth was thrown at his face He was reviled at ; but he walked calmly as if nothing had happened He said to himself. The people are delirious. They are ignorant, Ignorance cannot distinguish good and bad. This is only a sign of their weakness and stupidity. He turned back and spoke : "My brethren ! let your conscience awake. Let your discrimination be right Besmirch not your reputation as human beings. Remember, He who loves others exalts himself and becomes one with God, but he who pains others abuses himself and is lost to death."

Gautama was the foremost disciple of Mahâvîra. He was one of the greatest Intellectuals of his time. His eagerness to know the truth carried him to the loftiest height of erudition. Mahâvîra had great admiration and love for him, Once as he went out for Bhiksha (alms), Ananda, a householder, invited him and said "Reverened Sir, I am endowed with supraesnsual knowledge. I can perceive the things directly without the help of the mind or

sense" Gautama was wonderstruck. He replied · "You are an egotist. You should never try to disparage the knowledge of ascetics. You must accept retribution for your egregious lie before the Master

Ananda said . "Good sir ! I am in quandary Who is to repent ? One who speaks the truth or the one who refuses to believe it ?" Gautama narrated the incident to the Master, and the Lord said : "Gautama, you have erred. Go and beg pardon of Ananda. Who is on the right path. He has been enlightened." The Lord continued : "Beloved is he to me, who is humble and submissive Gautama, truth knows no barriers of asceticism or worldliness, or nobility or serfdom, of intelligence or rusticism. It dawns on the deserved "

The asceticism of Mahâvîra was unparalleled He loved truth and was ready to sacrifice everything to safeguard it

Arjuna, a gardener went with his wife to a temple and importuned the god for divine favours Some youths who also came there had badeye on his beautiful wife and planned to molest her. As soon as Arjuna got out, they fell on him and shackled him They forced the good lady to yield to their lecherous demands She protested, but in vain Arjuna saw this ghastly deed and his indignation rose to white heat, he was energised by the deity of the temple He broke the shackles with all his might and rushed at the youths and killed them all along with his wife and at the same time took on oath to kill six men and one woman every day. He continued his murders for nearly six months. Hundreds of men and women fell victim to his wrath

Mahâvîra happened to visit that place. People were going to pay their respects to the Lord Sudarshan, a man of strong will, was also on his way to the Lord As soon as Arjuna noticed him passing, he rushed forward to kill the man. But to his utter surprise his strength failed him He stood like a lifeless doll, Sudarshan's soul force had subdued his brute force and turned him replete with love and sympathy. Introced by Sudarshan Arjuna, in whom love had manifested itself, fell at the feet of Lord Mahâvîra and repented for his senseless murders. The Lord embraced him and accepted him as one of his disciples Arjuna became an ascetic. He went out for Bhiksha As the people

sighted him, they were thrown into consternation, for the memory of their beloved ones killed by him rose afresh in their minds, and they thought of sweet revenge. Stones were pelted at him. They abused him and charged him severely with sticks. They clouted him and injured him. But he never deviated from the path of saintliness. Some shouted : "He has killed my father," There were others who shouted : "He has killed my mother and wife." Yet another shouted with grief : "He has put an end to my beloved brother and sister." But Arjuna thought : "Now I am ascetic." I have to bear all the mental pangs and physical travails similingly. A man's mettle is tested in adversity. I must retain the purity of my heart and never think ill of these people who are taking their revenge upon me."

Thus he pacified his mind and bore all his trials with equanimity of thought. He returned to the Lord. The Lord had known all the facts, He said : "Arjuna ! Let truth dawn upon you. Let the people trouble you with blows and revilings. Let them rave and rant, carp and cavil. Be calm Enlightenment manifests in those who love their malefactors. He alone is beloved to me who does not know the world of hatred or attachment. Go ahead, let the inner light enlighten your path."

Lord Mahâvîra was a physician, not only to the elite, but to all beings irrespective of their calling or vocation. All were treated alike by him, extended his services He to all those who were sick of evil

Once Lord Mahâvîra was standing in meditation. A farmer, who was on his way to his fields to sow, passed that way. He saw Mahâvîra and said, "Oh, Monk ! I have to attend to some urgent work at home Look after my bullocks till I return." Mahâvîra was in deep meditation. He did not reply but the farmer left his bullocks there and went back to his home. After some time he returned and was distressed to find his animals missing. He cried out loudly; and Mahâvîra, but the tater kept silent. The farmer repeated his question, but again he received no response. He abused Mahâvîra and thrust a long iron nail into his ear which came outside the next one. Mahâvîra was still silent. Not a cry came out from out his mouth. The paroxysm of the farmer's anger had not subsided, although he now noticed his bullocks grazing in

a nearby field. He took his animals and went away without paying any heed to Mahâvîra's pains.

The Lord experienced terrible pain, but did not protest or think of taking revenge on the ignorant farmer. It was due to the fact that he was beyond mundane existence. He was only thinking : "How ignorent are the people ? They commit sins without knowing their consequences. I have dedicated my whole life for the betterment of the masses thry can use me as an instrument for their final beatitude; but I am horribly, greived when they make me an instrument of hell. Let discrimination come to them. Let their ignorance vanish and light of knowledge dawn upon them.

Indra, the King of God, once appeared before Lord Mahâvîra and said : "Lord, I say unto you that the ignorant people will put you to great hardships. As such, I wish to extend my services to you, I shall always be with you and protect you from the troubles." The Lord said, "Oh Indra ! This can never be, I have indomitable courage. I will work for my own emancipation. Man is the architect of his own fortune. Self-illuminated : souls never seek help from others. They face all their tribulations happily."

Mahâvîra experienced all these brutal pains and became more and more spiritual-minded. He taught, "Pains should be entertained and endured because they lead to purification of the sins and engender the feeling of fearlessness and equanimity. Body is mortal. Soul is immortal. Pain is inflicted on the body, not on the soul, Forbearance leads to beatitude."

Udrayana was the great monarch of Sindhusouvira He was an ardent disciple of Lord Mahâvîra. Once the Lord went to his country. The monarch came out to pay his respects with all his paraphernalia. He was obsessed with his opulence and considered himself to be the only man of high riches. People of all ranks were pouring in to hear the Lord—They too had come each in his own grandeur The king saw them and felt a mean satisfaction to notice that none was fortunate enough to rival him. He felt unbounded happiness. But after a while, he was painfully disappointed to see a greater monarch, with more riches approaching the Lord. He felt that his affluence was meagre as compared to the other's. He wanted to subdue him at any cost

and deeply engrossed himself in planning a strategem. But suddenly a beam of light flashed into his mind, and he bowed at the feet of Mahâvîra and prayed. "Sir, I am in a quandary. I know not how to solve it. I want to conquer all my rivals. Show me the path.' The Lord spoke to him, "Oh King ! Let truth be with you. Realise that affluence can never be cowed by affluence. That is the path of vying. It makes one envious. If you really desire to triumph over the feeling awake and resolve to tread the thorny path of renunciation. True renunciation consists in regarding nothing as one's own. Abandon, renounce and you will come out victorious. The true path of emancipation is renunciation. Give up everything and then you will find that the whole wealth of the universe rolls under your feet. One who renounces establishes his superiority over the whole world. Renunciation engenders non-attachment, which ensures true and eternal peace and tranquility. Material affluence begets mirthless apotheosis of enjoyment. It is of no avail. Wake up, give up and come into my fold. You will find that you have become an oasis of peace amidst the arid desert of existence." Udrayana at once renounced everything and turned ascetic. Now the rival king stood confounded and humbly bowed down before the royal monk, lately King of Sindhu-souvira.

It was late in the evening, when a man was climbing up a hill. He was alone. Suddenly he saw a dreadful apparition fast approaching. He was afraid of its shadow. He began to tremble. He was completely overpowered by the fear of a ghost and was thrown into consternation for a while.

But his terror was relieved as the figure came nearer. He was pleasantly surprised to notice that it was no other than a man like him. It was Mahâvîra. The man recognised him and bowed low at his feet. He told him all about the fear he had experienced only a few minutes earlier.

Lord Mahâvîra said : "You were afraid of my shadow. The deceptive evening light had distorted its shape. Thus you took me to be a ghost. Remember shadows are always deceptive. They delude the world. This universe is full of such delusion. Our senses never lead us to reality. They are faulty. Never rely on them. Try to search the truth beyond the senses. Truth will be infallible then."

Man is higher than the gods, this is the main precept of Lord Mahâvîra. He declared "Man is great, not because he is endowed with the highest intellect, but because he has infinite strength to exert and work for his own emancipation. Man's consciousness is more developed than the gods' because of his renunciatory capacity."

Indra once wanted to conquer a mundane king by flaunting before him his material wealth and affluence. Mahâvîra said to the King, when he approached him : "Oh King" You are a man. He who knows the infinity of his own strength knows no defeat. Strength of renunciation is higher than the strength of accumulation." The King turned ascetic and the Kind of Gods. Indra, had to bow down to his feet.

Thus Lord Mahâvîra established the superiority of men over the gods and made them conscious of their latent strength.

What is Religion ?

The history of religion is as old as human life. So long as the mystery of life and death prevails, religion will play an important role in life But the pertinent question is—what is religion ?

Defining religion, Lord Mahâvîra said . "Religion is the nature of the soul, purity unbounded. In other words, that which is bereft of all the passions is religion ; freedom from attachment and repulsion is religion; to dwell in the self is religion and everything else is delusion."

The Lord continued : "Those who entangle themselves in the rigmarole of rituals can never realise the truth Rituals are like a rough rind which covers the sweet fruit. The rind is essential for it helps the fruit to grow, but it cannot serve the purpose of the fruit Hence those who give too much importance to rituals and ignore the main tenets of religion are like those who love the rind and not the fruit Rituals are meant to inspire an individual to think of the 'Self' and go ahead in the quest of truth. They are the means and not the end. When their spirit is lost and they are made absolute, they should then be shunned and got rid of "

Once Lord Mahâvîra came out of the city of Rajagriha and went to Nalanda, where he spent the night. Early next morning while passing through the streets, he noticed at one place, some people engaged in philosophical discussions. He aproached them

and said : "Oh ! you are all busy discussing high philosopy. Can you answer my simple question, "Why should one practice religion ?" They at once replied, "We should do so to achieve material prosperity here." Mahâvîra merely said, "No" and walked on. At a short distance the Lord reached a temple where people were singing a chant. The tumult of the sound was powerful and penetrating. He went inside and repeated the same question to the singers. They were immersely engrossed in the music, yet replied. "Sir, religion makes our future life happy and so we adhere to it." The Lord again gave a negative reply and proceeded further on his way.

He was now nearing a big city. A huge congregation caught his eye. On an elevated platform a robust man was addressing the audience. He was discussing religion. Mahâvîra stopped a while. When the lecture was over, he repeated the question to the people. Their leader stated : "We live in a material world. Man becomes happy with fame and name. Therefore religion is practised to acquire these." Mahâvîra again nodded his head in the negative, and went away.

Now he had reached the outskirts of the town. A dilapidated house attracted his attention. He went inside and saw to his great surprise a man in simple dress sitting in the corner of a room performing meditation. His eyes were closed and he was completely engrossed in his job. Some time after he opened his eyes and found the Lord standing before him. He hastily got up, bowed with reverence and welcomed Mahâvîra. The Lord repeated the same question to him. The man replied, "Lord, religion is infinite. It is the nature of the soul. It should be practised for the spiritual betterment of a life. Purity of life is the pre-requisite of spiritual development." The Lord exclaimed : "There you are ! You are on the right path. You have truly embibed the essence of religion I can prophesy you emancipation is not far away. You have attained the material light. It shall light your path Go ahead " The news spread throughout the city. A few hours later men and women assembled in a big congregation. The whole city was in excitement. They all came to Lord Mahâvîra and requested him to throw light on the true application of religion. Thus the Lord stated:

1. Religion should not be practised for material prosperity of this life.
2. It should not be practised for the material prosperity of a future life.
3. It should not be practised for name or fame.
4. Religion should be only practised for the purification of the heart and for the enlightenment of the self.

In those days certain religious heads went about preaching. "You will be emancipated only if you come into my fold." The Lord repudiated this and declared it to be bigotry. He said, "Those who are awakened will be emancipated, even though they are not bound to any-ism, creed, sect or community. Emancipation knows no barriers of meaningless appellations. It comes from purity of heart. Purity is beyond distinction."

In this respect the thoughts of Mahâvîra were clear and bereft of absolutism. Those who regard their religion as the best, turn obstinate through its obsession and in the long run, the idea of obliterating every other religion takes hold of them. Thus they deviate from the right path and go a miss.

We must learn to look upon all the different religions not as incompatibles but as complementaries. The Lord declared : "Truth can never be depicted in totality, though it can be realised totally. All the seers have realised it but intepreted it in different ways. All are ture. They are indispensable to each other for the relisation of the common end." This is what Jainism teaches.

Mahâvîra further exhorted : "Wherever you dwell, to whatever-ism you belong, let your quest for truth be unobstructed. Proceed, do not stop. Truth will dawn upon you. Don't be obstinate. Obstinancy leads to destruction. Enlightenment comes to the open-minded.

In those days, it was said, "Sadhana can only be done in solitary places which are free from the din and clamour of civilisation. Sadhana can only be accomplished in jungles." The Lord explained : "Sadhana is free from territorial limitations. One who is eager in his quest, one who is always wide-awake, one who is free from intellectual ratiocinations, one who is dedicated truly and solely to his aim can do sadhana at home, anywhere, even amidst a huge congregation." But one who is devoid of

these qualities can never reach even the fringes of Sadhana, be he aforest dweller or a recluse. One who perceives and realises God in 'self' can do sadhana at all times, at all places, without any inhibitions.

Sahdana is product of renunciation. It crops up when indulgence in sensual pleasures has been eradicated and the gustatory leanings rooted out completely. Thus one can say that Mahâvîra's thoughts on Sadhana were very comprehensive and universal in its application. He wanted that the whole personality should be integrated with one's Sadhana. He always stood against dual standards in practice. There was often a big hiatus between precept and practice. He condemned this and exhorted the people to bridge this yawning gulf. He said, "Realise Dharma. Let wisdom illumine your heart. Try to alleviate the load of grievances of your brethern. Let your day to day behaviour be strictly in accordance with your religious practices. Religion is not concealed in books or confirmed to particular places. It is not in doctrines and dogmas, it is realisation, being and becoming."

It was also said that the male alone was entitled to practise Sadhana and get rid of his shackles. The Lord stated, "This is fallacy. Sadhana is free from all such considerations as male or female. All are endowed with in finite strength and knowledge. Nay all living beings, big or small, are provided with this invaluable treasure. They can work up and break away all the shackles which keep them bound. One who has annihilated the distinctions of male and female. One who sees and perceives the soul in all creatures can triumph over this mundane existence. These distinctions obscure the path of self-realisation.

Fearlessness

Mahâvîra preached the doctrine of fearlessness and non-attachment. He said, "Frealessness is the first requisite of spirituality. One who is afraid is a coward. One who is himself frightened or frightens others, can never be a votary of non violence and can never be religious. The glow of strength gets extinguished when fear and attachment to life lead to bondage. One who is indifferent to pleasure and pain, gain and loss, reputation and slander, blessings and curses, is realty a great soul, fit for spiritual endeavour and self-realisation." Mahâvîra

triumphed over all the obstacles on his way to emancipation. His courage was scintillating. He realised that the soul is a torrent of boundless energy. It has limitless power and knowledge. Excitements, perplexities, worries and vacillations make it appear weak. If this veneer of delusion is wiped out, man is free to act and reach his destination.

The Lord exhorted : "Awake, Awake ! Always keep awake. Those who are alert to the inner voice of the soul are the paragons of excellence. They reach the height of perfection which knows no downfall. Gain ascendancy over your passions, fears, excitements and lust and then feel how prosperous and vigorous you are Never think of distitution. Poor are those who are ignorant of their own strength and virtues which lie latent in them. If you are conscious of these, you can accelerate the momentum of the perennial flow of power in you and everyone else Kindle your heart, and flood yourself with its illumination. You will then see for yourself what a torrent of boundless energy you are !"

Fatalism

The theory of fatalism was very much in vogue those days. The dust and din of this philosophgy enveloped all quarters. According it man was only a doll in the hands of fate and thus made him lethargic and lazy.

The Lord flailed this theory in words like : "Man is the sole architect of his life. He is free to act. But it is also true that actions produce reactions. Each man is free to endeavour, free to sow but not to reap Endeavour gives shapes to fate and as these are within one's control, fate becomes the individuals' own creation. If the present is lived skilfully, one's future will not be dark, Don't resign yourself to the thought that you are a doll in the hands of fate. Realise your strength, make such endeavours as form a good fate for you. Always feel that you can find your path even in the enveloping darkness of fate."

Compassion and Service

It was also thought then that a particular dress or other paraphernalia was essential for as life of virtue. In this context the following anecdote is instructive.

A certain man had two sons. The younger of the two

cultivated in him a sense of compassion and respect for the religious vows and tried to be true to these in his dealings in life. The elder one used to go to the temple, importune God for all kinds of favours and meditate for hours together. This was his daily routine. He strictly observed all the rules laid down for doing pooja and offering oblations to the diety. He thought he was one with God while in meditation.

The younger one never visited temples or holy places, he used to practise all the norms of religion in day-to-day life. His actions always projected the true image of a devotee. His transactions were honest and his behaviour was virtuous. He never hated or cheated anybody nor committed theft He acted up to his beliefs.

One day the elder brother was returning from the temple. He noticed a wounded man crying for help. But he hurried away without paying any heed to him. A few steps further he met another who had borrowed some money from him for spending in the treatment of his diseased mother. She was lying on her death bed. The elder brother stopped him and demanded the return of his money. The client replied, "My mother is one her death bed. I have not even a single pie for her treatment I am beset by troubles on all sides. How can I pay your debt right now ? I promise, however, to pay you back very soon " But to no avail. The elder brother insisted on immediate payment, and when this was not done he went to the debtor's house and sequestrated everything except the bed on which his mother was lying.

In the meantime, the younger brother was also on his way home. He noticed the wounded man crying for help. He was in a hurry. Still he went to him and behaved as he would towards a member of his own family. He dressed his wounds, gave him something to eat and drink, and finally took him to an inn He asked the innkeeper to look after him and paid the expenses as well. The next day he heard about the man whose meagre property had been confiscated by his elder brother. He was rather upset and so moved with pity that he approached the man, made sufficient arrangements for his sick mother's treatment, and gave him the required money to pay his elder brother. Thus he performed his social duty towards a fellow being. The man who

was in trouble fell on his knees, and said "May God be always with you. You are God's almoner."

The Lord alluding to this story commented. "Beloved is he to me who has mercy and compassion. Who is moved by the pangs and sorrows of others, who is not cruel, who is true at heart, and who loves humanity from the depth of his being. Compassion and love are the two requisites for self-realisation. One who is devoid of these is never religious. There are two kinds of people. Those who entangle themselves in the intricacies of rituals, but never imbibe the essence of religion; they are hypocrites. Those, on the other hand, who never observe any religious rites, but are true to their heart are religious in the proper sense. Purity of heart is religion, mere externals constitute hypocrisy."

Friend and Foe

A man went to Lord Mahâvîra and arrogantly claimed— "Sir, I have subdued all my enemies and now I have sense of friendliness towards them. I have been taught to treat all enemies as friends "

The Lord stated : "You are still only half-way to truth. I say unto you, the safe way is not to consider any one as one's enemy and then treat him as a friend. It is a falae notion. In this world of ours none is an enemy. Your belief in one makes you accept him as a friend, while disbelief in the other generates in you the feeling of unfriendliness. If you consider others as your enemies, it means you do not delieve in 'self'. This is a delusion. Go ahead and develop the feeling of equality towards all. You will then see that in this world of diversity, none is your foe, all are friends."

"Do not look outside for peace and tranquility. Your soul is the perennial source of strength and peace. Go in quest of it, awaken your soul and springs of peace and happiness will gush forward Material things can give you pleasure, but not eternal happiness. If you really desire to be happy peep into the soul, practise equilibrium of mind. You will enjoy peace in its totality."

"Oh man ! You are a treasure house of infinite strength. You are the architect of your fortune. Have firm belief in labour, Exert yourself, and you will enjoy the fruits thereof. One who has abiding faith in self-exertion is a man of distiny. Through faith you can become what you wish to be "

"Don't be bigoted. Truth is infinite. To acquire it in totality, require hard penance and austerities. The truth you have attained is only a part of the whole, not the whole. Incessant efforts reveal different phases of truth, and as we proceed further, we are illumined. Never stop The destination is far away. Don't think that you alone have the light and all others are groping in darkness. Never be obstnate. Obstinacy conceals truth. It diverst from the path of righteousness. Don't entangle yourself in altercations. Try to understand the views of others and feel that they are also worth considering. This is the right way of reconciliation. Truth is one. The modes of expression are infinite. They differ from man to man. Do not go amiss. Truth is not a matter for talk but for realisation. Seek the unity of religious or thoughts not in a common creed, but in a common quest."

"Thoughts can never be identical. But they can be reconciled. We can find unity in diversity. You should have burning desire. Everywhere you will see truth face to face. If you are obstinate, the visible truth will disappear. Don't impose your thoughts on others. All have their own ways of approach. The kingdom of truth can be reached through different ways."

"Pleasure and pain are the creations of our own soul. It is our friend as well as our foe. Control yourself. One who has control over himself becomes happy, but one two becomes a slave to it, finds himself in trouble. Give fight to all your weaknesses. One who comes out victorious in this fight, becomes a world conqueror and safely crosses the ocean of strifes and tribulations.

"I say your own soul is the creator, destroyer and protector of your being. Never entrust these three functions to any other outside agency. Belief in the creation of the 'self' will lead you to self-exertion, which in turn will make you more energetic and active. Don't be a mere doll in the hands of others. Realise that you have your own independent entity. Only through this perception, the floodgates of divinity will remain open to you.

"If you really want to be happy, strike at the very root of unhappiness Ignorant people try to allay those troubles, but never try to root out their fundamental causes. If the causes persist, their effects can never be got over. A tree flourishes as long as its roots

are active and able to fetch the food content for the growth of the tree. If the roots are dried up, the tree withers. So is, the case with the tree of troubles; therefore hit hard at its root and the troubles will vanish.

"Behold ! All are equal. High and low, mean and great, is the outcome of our mental misapprehension Casteism is unreal there is only one caste i.e.,; the human caste. Those who favour casteism are hypocrites They provide the momentum to communal virus. They do not know the truth. All outward distinctions are only just names. Through all these differences, the incessant flow of consciousness is present. It is beyond duality. It knows no discriminations. It is the same in one and all. I say again and again, don't entertain arrogance of caste. Don't look upon yourself as high and others as low. Practise equality. In this world none is high and none is low, neither big nor small. This is due to the fact that the soul is neither high nor low. It is exactly similar everywhere Don't consider others as untouchables, untouchability is a blot on the name of our society All are equal, humanity is one whole

"Believe man reaps as he sows Bad actions generate evil and good deeds bring good results. Actions are never barren. Man is independent to act but dependent on the consequences. So keep wake, and always think good thoughts and do good deeds Thoughts materialise into deeds · therefore, be pure in word, deed and mind

Religion resides in pure heart. Hearts which are impure cannot accommodate religion Those who think that religion is meant to make one happy in the next world commit an egregious blunder. It your present life is spent in darkness, your next life too will never have light. It is the present which shapes the future. Don't be blind to the present Try to make it is lustrous as you can. Rest assured, you can then realise that your future will also be brilliant. One who does not feel tranquillity of mind in the present by practising Dhrama can never attain peace in the future. Religion is not prattle, it is live realisation.

"Beware of hypocrisy. It is the worst enemy of man and eats into the very vitals of his being and finally reduces him to nought. Be frank like a child which knows no concealment It is an open

book which he who runs may read, Wisdom ,dawns upon one, who is pure like a child. You want to practise Dharma; do it for emancipation from all bondages, and for the purification of the soul. Never do it for material prosperity, reputation, fame or other secular advantages. Do it solely for spiritual betterment. All these material advantages come of their own accord. They are like husk which is a twin of the corn. Nobody tills his land for producing husk. He tills it for the corn, Yet the busk, is there. Likewise, material prosperity and affluence follows spiritual advancement. Let your whole personality be spiritualised. You will see that religion manifests itself in differnt phases, which are all parts of one whole.

"Religion consists of two parts, non violence and tolerance. One who cannot tolerate the hardships of life, can never be a votary of non-violence. Non-violence is for him who is friendly to all, even to his enemies, who tolerates revilings and never feels disturbed. One who remains undisturbed in pleasure and pain is really an Ahimsaka.

"Troubles are the products of our own desires, even after knowing the truth man gets himself caught in this trap of unsatisfying desires.

"Animosity increases animosity; even after knowing this well, man indulges in such activities which multiply enmity.

"Weapons enhance unrest; knowing this dictum fully well, man wants of manufacture weapons to establish peace and tranquility. The Lord said, "He alone can swim across the ocean of strife and travails who knows the unquenchable aspect of desires and has pluck to abandon them.

"He alone can be free from animosity who knows the grave consequences of it and has faith to get rid of it.

"He alone can be free from weapon who knows its frightful consequences and the path to renounce them. Hence if you want to get rid of desires, be detached from material objects. Educate your mind and senses.

"If you want to be free from the feelings of enmity, have raport with all without any distinctions. Try to be free from passions.

"If you want to be free from the dread of weapons material

or non-material, peep inside; reach into the depth of the soul and feel the limitless energy therein. Fear engenders fear. One who is afraid of others is a coward. One who frightens others is also a coward."

Sect and Religion

Mahâvîra founded an association consisting of monks, nuns, laymen and lay-women for the sadhana of Dharma. He believed in collective dedication and encouraged this spirit among his followers. But he always considered religion and sect to be two different units., which through somewhat related, yet had their independent entity. He referred to four kinds of men :

1. Some renounce the sect, but not the religion.
2. Some renounce the religion, but not the sect.
3. Some renounce both i.e., the religion and the sect.
4. Some retain both i.e., religion and the sect.

The first and fourth are on the right path. They love truth more than their sect After all, what counts is not creed but conduct, which is religion applied. Sect is an instrument to inspire those who want to dedicate their lives to renunciation. It gives momentum to the zeal and enthusiasm of a Sadhaka and makes his way smooth. It was this that made Lord Mahâvîra to organise his creed but he was quite alert. His religion was not smothered by sectarianism. He said, "those who love their sects more than truth, exterminate themselves through arrogance. One can realise the truth only by abandoning all kinds of external bondage. Sect is also a bondage. One who moves in the direction of truth realisation attains it in totality while the one who sticks only to the creed without paying any heed to truth goes astray. We cannot realise truth so long as we are obstinate in our thought, always assert that we are in possession of light and wisdom and all others are in darkness; obstinacy leads to destruction."

Way to Non-abolutism

One day it so happended that two disciples of Mahâvîra indulged in philosophical discussions. Arguments continued for a long time. Both were proud of their erudition. No one was ready to yield. Logic never leads to a conclusion.

At last they came to Lord Mahâvîra, and said, "Lord !

Please guide us, give us the light of prudence." And Lord Mahâvîra stated, "Logic makes us blind. It never leads us any where. Remember truth is pervasive; it cannot be circumscribed. Try to understand what others say, because every assertion depicts truth in its own light. One who can see that light can never maintain that others are in darkness. Every thought has its own individuality worthly of reverence, because it depicts truth in its own limits. Don't consider that a particular standpoint is the only true representation of reality. Reality is one and whole, but it manifests in different ways in different ages."

Once a man enquired as to what Jainism is, and the Lord replied : "Jainism is synthesis of different throughts expressed from different points of view. All standpoints are relative. They can never be absolute, their relatedness leads to the whole truth. Exclusive absolutism is inconsistent with the theory of Syadvad."

The theory of non-absolutism is the pivot of the teachings of Lord Mahâvîra. His thoughts were much appreciated. There was not an iota of bigotty in his views. He always regarded other's views quite as important as his own. He always said : "Truth is one, but the paths which lead to it are many. Truth is primary, paths are secondary. Stick to the truth, never tarry on the path. We must have reverence towards others. We must have suavity of disposition and courtesy of manner. Suavity leads of reality."

Reconciliation

One day Lord Mahâvîra was delivering his sermon before a huge congregation. Gautama, the foremost disciple, was also present there. Mahâvîra said, "Gautama ! get up, your beloved friend monk Skandaka, who is initiated in a different cried, is fast approaching you. Go ahead, and receive him." Gautama went a few steps, and cried, "Welcome to Skandaka ! Welcome to Skandaka !" Both came and sat at the feet of Lord Mahâvîra.

The Lord observed ; "All religions have the same goal of self realisation. We must seek the unity of religions, not in a common creed, but in a common quest. We must look for the truth in them and try to reconcile them, so that all religions may form a strategem to eradicate evils from the face of the earth. Don't quarrel, don't indulge in altercations. They lead to destruction."

Knowledge is light

One day a young disciple came to Mahâvîra and sat nearby in an eager mood. Mahâvîra asked what troubled him ? He replied, "Reverend Lord, you are my master. You are illumined and omniscient. All my problems are solved by you. Whenever a question comes before me, I come to you and give an answer which solves all my difficulties. I have a special place to live in I have got enough clothes to cover my body. I receive food and drink to satisfy my hunger and quench my thirst. So why should I read and educate myself in the scriptures ? After all, the scriptures satisfy only intellectual curiosity, which I can do through you."

The Lord advised "Vatsa ! You are still in ignorance, Knowledge leads to illumination It is light, and ignorance is darkness. Others knowledge is of no use. Knowledge of the self leads one to the righteous path. Don't you know the parable of that blind man who lost his life through dependence on the eyes of others listen to me as I say unto you.

The parable says : "There lived a blind old man in a village of Bihar He had ten sons All of them were married. One day the eldest son said to his father, 'You are not able to see It is better you get your eyes cured. It will make life easier and more comfortable ' The old man replied, 'No why should I care for my two eyes even though I do not have my own eyes. I have forty two eyes, I have twenty eyes of my ten sons and twenty eyes of my ten daughters-in-law, and two eyes of my wife. These forty-two eyes are enough for me to keep me out of danger. All laughed at his answer. They persuaded him again and again to get his eyes cured, but he would listen to none. They all said, 'One's own eyes are more powerful and helpful than the eyes of the whole world ' But the old man did not stand from his stand. The members of the family were kind enough to recognise his weakness and senility.

Days and months passed by. One day all of a sudden the house was on fire. All were alarmed at this critical situatation. They began to take out everything from the house. All were active All the valuables were taken out. All concerned themselves only with the valuables. They forgot the old man he was crying aloud. But nobody heard his cries and he was burnt alive."

The Lord continued : "This parable stresses that two eyes of one's own are more valuable than the eyes of a thousand others. Had that old man cared for his two eyes, he would not have died in that dreadful fire. Likewise education of self saves from all the hazards and perils, incessantly accruing in life. Go, acquire knowledge which is a precious treasure. Do not depend upon the knowledge of others. Ignorance deprives one of self-illumination. I say knowledge should be required for four reasons :

(a) To gain concentration of mind.
(b) To have the correct knowledge of things.
(c) To establish self in religion.
(d) To inspire, exhort, and establish others in the field of religion.

Knowledge is like a light. When you acquire knowledge you become like a light. Light dispels darkness. The light shines, it spreads light, it diffuses light.

Doubt leads to Destruction

It was a cold winter night. Chillana, the queen of the Magadha emperor Srenik, was asleep. The breeze was very cold and fresh, the sky was clear, the moon was shining and the stars were twinkling. Silence prevailed evreywhere. Srenika went to his bedroom and noticed that the queen was fast asleep. The sound of her breathing was clearly audible. All of a sudden the queen murmured in her sleep. "Oh ! what will he be doing ?" The king heard these words and was dumb struck. The word 'he' pierced through his heard like a sharp arrow. He stood amazed for a while and thought, "the chastity of my wife is unquestioned, but the word 'he' and the manner of her expression engenders suspicion in me. It seems she has gone amiss and has done a wrong I cannot tolerate this misdemeanour, I must punish her."

He at once came out of the bed room and ordered his Prime Minister Abhyakumar to burn Chillana alive, by setting fire to the palace. The Prime Minister was a man of high wisdom and intrepidity. He pondered over the situation very deeply and decided, he would not burn the palace, but would wait and gather the facts.

Srenika went to Lord Mahâvîra and enquired about the chastity of his queen. The Lord said, "Oh king ! She is pure and

chaste, you have taken a wrong decision in haste, and for this you will have to repent."

"To err is human, Senses and the mind are the two instruments of our knowledge. They never lead to a right decision, Don't depend upon them solely."

Srenika went back to his palace and asked Abhaya Kumar whether he had carried out his orders. This answer was in the negative, Srenika was glad. He immediately came to the queen and enquired about her murmuring in the sleep the previous night. She thus replied, "Yesterday, while I was passing through a hill side, I noticed a lonely house facing the hill. But it was in a dilapidated condition. There were many breaches and cracks in the house. It seemed that nobody had ever plugged in the breaches and repaired the cracks. In one of its corners a saint was standing in a meditative posture. His eyes were half closed, his hands were stretched downwards, and his feet close to each other. There was no movement whatsoever.

"The sun had gone down. The night was fast approaching. It was terribly cold. The strong cold wind was buffetting the standing monk. But he was neither shivering nor trembling. He was looking like a sculpture carved in white granite. Everything was quiet and peaceful except my curiosity and thoughts. They were rising in succession as the billows in a fiery sea.

"I stood there gazing at the saint and his meditative posture It appeared to me as though the body of the saint was made of hard steel to be able to stand all the severe tortures and pains of the cold draught. But I was not able to remain there due to the icy cold weather which was prevailing. I was shivering. I left that place and reached our palace. The face and the body—structure of the monk obsessed my thoughts. The whole scene was very much alive in my memory : particularly the howling cold wind and the perseverance of the monk overwhelmed me, and thoughts of his pluck and valour incessantly recurred as streams pouring into the river from all directions. The full image of the monk was featured in my mind, and I was completely overpowered by that masculine posture. I slept with a disturbed mind, Dreams came in succession. With the advance of the darkness of the night, the cold also became very severe. I was shivering even in my warm

bedroom. At that critical juncture I murmured in sleep : What will he be doing ?"

Srenika heard her patiently. His doubt was cleared. His suspicion was dissolved. He again went to Lord Mahâvîra and narrated the whole story. The Lord stated, "Things are not what they seem. If you want to arrive at the truth, dive deep. You will then get the precious pearls and diamonds. The sea of truth is unfathomable by supersititions and doubts. They are like the froth which floats on the surface of the sea. Wipe them away and plunge deep. Everything will be crystal clear. Don't disbelieve others. Try to understant them. This understanding will open the flood-gates of reality and you will reach the above of truth which is all-pervasive.

Eternal Life

Once a king came to Lord Mahâvîra and asked. "Oh, Lord ! how I can attain eternal life ?" The Lord replied, "Be good to your heart. Let your precept and practice be in accordance with each other. You should always follow the righteous path. Let your knowledge and perception be correct. Right knowledge, right perception, and right character lend to eternal life."

The king again spoke, "Lord ! It is correct, I have been following your path with sincerity of heart and mind. My knowledge and perception are correct. My character is unquestioned. I lead a life of righteousness. Yet I feel that eternal life is beyond my reach. Where do I fall sort ?"

The Lord then said, "If you really want to realise eternal life, try to eradicate the causes of attachement lying latent in your. Arrogance of erudition, family pride and love of luxuries are causes which bar progress. Renounce everything and tread my path. I say that riches are the real obstacle in the path of emancipation. Riches are not able to save anybody from the certain danger of death. They are futile, Riches engender fear and arrogance. These two are the worst enemies of mankind. So if you want to achieve eternal happiness, renounce everything you have, and become spiritually rich. Spiritual progress cannot be gained by increasing riches in leaps and bounds. The doors of heaven are closed to people possessing material riches and devoid of the spiritual ones."

Slave Trade

Once Lord Mahâvîra was entering the beautiful city of Rajagraha. The whole town went wild with excitement. Every one was curious to know all about the Lord. They asked one another, "Who is he ? Some identified him as the prophet of the age, who had come to save humanity. Others declared he was the Lord of the age. Mahâvîra was passing through the streets of the town. Suddenly he noticed a big crowd of tradesmen talking loudly. He went near the crowd. He was astonished to notice that people were buying and selling human beings. It was slave trade. The slaves consisted of all ages and both sexes, young, old, children, men and women. His heart was filled with compassion. He stood up on the raised platform and 'harangued in a loud voice : "Oh ! My dear devotees ! You are all groping in darkness. Ignorance has obscured your vision, and you have become deaf to the dictates of your heart It is violence of make slaves. They all are your brothers and sisters. It is violence to exercise authority over others; it is violence to subjugate others; it is violence to kill others; and it is equally violence to pain others. Treat them as equals."

The slaves in chains heard him. Their faces gleamed with joy. They cried out : "Oh ! The Saviou of mankind, you are the real redeemer of mankind; you are the apostle of truth and non-violence."

The traders were taken aback; their hearts too opened to the light. They joined in chorus. "Oh ! The Saviour of mankind ! We have been ignorant all this time. You have illumined our hearts. We will no more carry on this ignoble slave trade. We have now learnt that every human being, nay, the whole world is equal. Equility is the predominant factor in the realm of independence. Head rules, but the heart influences. We are really moved by your pure and sacrosanct heart We have heard the rumbling of the grievances of our slaves, who are humans like us. It has stirred us to our depths. We promise we will never indulge in slave making or trading henceforth."

Thus Mahâvîra raised high his flag of anti-slave-trade, not merely because it is ignoble in character and spells exploitation. But because it is against the laws of human nature and non-violence

Thoughts make Events

Potanpur was a beautiful town surrounded by bamboo grooves on all sides. One day Lord Mahâvîra came there with his disciples. King Prasannachandra went to pay his tributes. The Lord exhorted him on the evanescent nature of the world and said that renunciation leads to final beautitude. The king's heart was stirred and he decided to renounce all worldly relations. He became an ascetic and engaged himself wholly in severe penance and austerities. He would remain engrossed in meditation and concentrastion for days together.

Once it happened that he was standing in meditation under a banyan tree. His hands were stretched above and eyes were half opened, His mind was free from all passions and emotions. His thoughts remained static. Some members of the royal family passed by. Seeing him in that posture. One of them remarked, "Oh ! What a saint ! His goal is not very far." Another man opined that he was a hypocrite; and countinued that his heart is not pure By giving the reins of the kingdom to his minor son, he has placed him under a heavy burden. I would say that he has cheate him. The young boy-king is not able to bear these great responsibilities. It strikes me that he will soon be deprived of his kingdom by his own ministers. Thus he will have to face many troubles."

The monk heard these words and lost his balance of mind. Meditation and concentration both went off the board. His mind began to plan to safeguard the kingdom for his son. Thoughts were incessantly rising. Soon they crystallised into a clever stratagem to subdue the enemies who were planning to harm the boy-king.

Srenika, the king, went to Lord Mahâvîra to ask him about the lot of the saini Prasnnachandra, who was a great ascetic indeed. Mahâvîra observed, "If he dies just soon he will go to the first hell." Srenika was surprised to hear this. After a while, he put the same question "Second hell," said the Lord. The king was much more puzzled. He was in a quandary. He went on asking the Lord, again and again. With every answer, the stage of hell went deeper still. Finally the Lord declared, "Now if he was to die, he will go to the seventh, the last hell."

Srenika paused for same time and once more posed the same question. The Lord replied, "Now he will go to the first heaven; now to the second..........now to the third .....and now to the last heaven. And finally to the utter bewilderment of the king, the Lord declared, "Oh king ! the saint has become omniscient, and has become emancipated. Now he is no more in this world."

The king said, "Lord, I am perplexed. Neither can I disbelieve you, nor does my intellect comprehend the emancipation of the saint. Please enlighten me."

The Lord said, "Emancipation comes to those who are pure in heart Our mind is never static; it runs like a mad horse, here, there and everywhere It is difficult to control it. It creates thoughts Thoughts materialise into events. These ultimately become the instruments of our rise and fall. A deluded mind weaves a web of attachments and becomes entangled therein, Remember, we create our thoughts, and these clear the path for us to tread. Always have good thoughts. They will yield good fruits The instance of the saint narrates the truth.

What happened to the saint-king was this. Though absorbed in meditation, he heard all the slander heaped on himself and his son. He was carried away by a paroxysm of anger and a deep longing for revenge overwhelmed his whole being These impure thoughts quickly led him astray and he became a victim of hell

At this stage came a passer by there. He watched the king-saint doing meditating and highly eulogised his life of renunciating and austerities The saint heard this also, and was soon remined of the new situation He thoughts—Oh ! I have gone amiss and preparated a blunder. Why should I be thinking of my kingdom and relatives. I have renounced everything. Renunciation knows neither kith nor kin. I have come alone, and I will have to leave this world alone It is essential that I work for my own emancipation and become truly free. Thus my life will become a beam of light and enlighen hundreds and thousands of devotees who are on the path of sadhana These thoughts helped him to return to his saintly ways, and he again concentrated on his self. It intensified and paved the way for his final emancipation "

Penance

Mahâvîra always advocated panance. At the same time, he also entered his caveats. As Sadhaka he led a very hard life, and underwent severe penance. He declared : "Bodily afflictions, if borne with perseverance, lead to emancipation." This did not mean that he voluntarily inflicted injuries on his body. He was against such penances as dissipate peace and tranquility of mind He was emphatic that those who did penance only for material benefits or to satisfy this or other worldy craving, they rensack their own soul These should be abandoned. Those who expose themselves to the hot sun, stand in water for days together, or torture their body by mutilating it, are ignorant people. They do not know reality. Torturing, even when the pain is calmly suffered, adversely affects the mind and fills it with arrogance. This is the sure way to destruction Any penance which involves or unsettles the mind is in reality violence, and not penance.

While Lord Mahâvîra was once passing through a forest, he became alone, as his disciples were somewhat left behind. He caught sight of a man hanging himself upside down from a tree. On the four sides fires were burning. On the top, the sun was shining hot a huge crowd was watching the scene. Mahâvîra stopped and made enquiries about the man. He was informed of the man's severed penances and the bodily tortures he had been bearing since very long. Mahâvîra smiled and said, "Brothers ! Try to find out the truth. Bodily tortures never lend to emancipation Penance should be solely directed towards self-realisation I say unto you ·

(1) Do not practise penance to gain material prosperity in this world.

(2) Do not practise penance to gain material prosperity in the future world.

(3) Do not practice penance for fame and renown.

(4) Perform penance only for the purification of the soul, for self-realisation.

Mahâvîra as Revolutionary

It is often said that Mahâvîra was not a revolutionary, but merely propagated the principles which were taught from old

days by the prophets of Jainism. It is also said that he repudiated casteism, deicried animal sacrifice and ridiculed the rituals etc. This is but a half truth. He did not work exclusively for the ending of these evils. He kept his vision very high. He aspired for the highest goal of life i.e., emancipation and worked for it. Non violence became manifest. In the light of it, all the evils became visible and the exponents of these evils were nonplussed. In the context of Ahimsa the Lord said, "No one in this world is great or small, high or low. Caste is unreal. Those who look on others as high or low on the basis of caste get stuck in the mire of self-delusion. Those who are of high character belong to the highest caste He alone is great who is free from the bonds of love and hatred. Spirituality knows no distinction of caste or creed, ignorance or knowledge, affluence or poverty

Mahâvîra was a radical and a revolutionary. No doubt he trod the path of his predecessors, but at the same time brought a new outlook to bear on the whole of Jain philosophy. Ahimas is an eternal truth. It is definite and everlasting. Mahâvîra looked at it from different angles, and applied it in solving the day to day problems of the age, Slave-trade, casteism, language problem and many similar intractables were solved through it. He revised and elaborated the rules governing monks and nuns; and presented a systematic code of conduct for the lay-devotees. The principle of religious tolerance was inculcated among the masses, and he declared with rare clarity and sincerity that self purification was not confined to any particular creed. He successfully refuted all bigoted theories which insisted that theirs was the only way of approach to truth, emancipation or salvation. This intolerant dogma was anathema to Mahâvîra. He always declared : "Truth is infinite, It knows no limitations Whosever exerts with zeal and an earnest desire to know truth can reach it. Truth knows no distinctions. It is beyond regional and every other limitations."

22

THE PHILOSOPHICAL TEACHINGS OF LORD MAHÂVÎRA

—Elizabeth Sharpe, F.R.G.S., K.H.M., etc.

Mahvira denies the *Advaitism*—one-ness, the spirit alone being real—of the Upanishads.

He posits duality: that the universe, as man knows, it is divided into two main categories: life—*jiva,* and non-life—*ajiva*; spirit and matter; and matter, it insists, is as eternal as spirit and as real.

Life (or soul, by itself is an intangible thing, and its presence is only determined by the manifestation of itself in a material body.

The manifestations of life (or soul) are consciousness, sense-activity and respiration· each life has a fixed period in the body it takes, determined by higher life before contact with that body, or not determined.

There are many souls in the universe. each retaining its individuality which is never entirely destroyed or merged into a higher being, unless its rhythm ebbs too low, when it may be annihilated in the sense of losing its identity.

There are two classes of these embodied souls : the immobile (*sthâvara*) and the mobile (*trasa*).

The first class is again divided into five sections according to the material from which it is formed. earth, water, fire, air or vegetation.

The last is counted the highest of this class: but all of them have only one sense, that of touch.

Still lower than these are the group souls (*nigoda*): an infinite number of beings with a common body and a common respiration.

They are in a continual process of evolution, and form the nucleus for the replacement of those souls who, having attained Nirvana, have passed out of the cycle of life and death.

There is no suggestion that contact with the higher life gives them the impetus: and it is a strange thought that these group-lives in man and beast are to re-place those Highest Beings who through millions of years of strife and evolution have, at last, attained to a state of beatitude, and a stability that admits no further change

The second class, the mobile, is divided into four types: those with two senses, those with three, those with four, and those with five. Those with one sense alone are microscopic organisms residing in other bodies: some in earth, some in water, some in air, some in light and so on

Oysters and worms, have two senses–those of taste and smell.

Ants and insects have three senses: those of taste, smell and touch.

Bees have four senses: those of taste, smell, touch & sight.

The five-sensed beings, birds and animals, have a fifth faculty, that of intelligence, the highest of them all, man, having discrimination as well; the power to discern between the beneficial and injurious.

Knowledge, the philosophy says, is inherent in every being with the consciousness that is in every life for consciousness itself is the quality of life or soul But this knowledge differs greatly in degree.

There are five kinds of knowledge

1 Knowledge derived through the senses in the observation of nature (*mati jnâna*).
2 Knowledge of the scriptures (*sruti jnâna*).
3 Knowledge by experience, one's own or that of another (*avadhi jnâna*).
4. Knowledge of distant objects, past or present, and the mind of others (*Manah-paryâya jnâna*).
5 Perfect and supreme knowledge of everything.

The first two are ordinary : the third and the fourth are possessed by philosophers, and the last one of all by the perfect man who is ready for the last stage of Nirvana–god-hood.

The second substance of the universe is matter; and this, again, is sub-divided into static matter, energy, rest, space, time.

The matter (*pudgala*) which, in certain stages, can be perceived by the senses is the grossest kind.

In this stage sight may perceive its colour; its quality may be tasted; it may be touched; it may be smelt. Matter is composed of atoms (*paramânus*) varying from the smallest molecule of two to an infinite number forming whole physical universes (*mahâskandha*), where, of course, it is obvious that neither the smallest atom of all, nor the largest conglomeration, can be held within the perception or reach of the senses of man.

Sub-dividing again, Mahâvîra advances a new and original thesis, for he posits two kinds of this static matter: the aforesaid grossest (*pudgala*), and a less gross matter, which retains impressions.

This new kind of matter is called *Karmaprayoga-pudgala*, and is associated with the old law of *karma*, a word now familiar to the Western world, to scholars and laymen alike, though, it has, hitherto, been used so loosely as to arouse a great deal of suspicion in the mind of scholars.

Gross matter (*pudgala*), reinforced by other matter of its kind, or diminished by contact with it, is the basic medium of bodies.

It is subject to change: its forms are subject to decay and death: and life uses them and discards them at death. No real affinity is ever formed between this matter and life.

But the other *karmic* matter// is in itself a by-product of life: for, it says, that it is the psychical activities of life, or soul, which bring about the condition of this matter, and the matter, once brought into existence, persists in the vicious circle of cause and effect: i.e., the emotions and desires of life,[1] that has already formed an association with matter for their expression, have, in their very expression, formed an effect, which, in its turn, will produce another cause with yet another effect, and so on, *ad infinitum*.

But, if once we free ourselves from the word *soul* as understood in the Upanishadic sense, keeping it strictly to its use as evolving life, we come back to philosophic reasoning thus· life takes for itself matter for expression, or, more correctly to philosophical Jain thesis, matter flows (*âsrava*) into life; and this conjunction of life and matter has a definite effect on both.

The intrinsic qualities of life are lessened in the degree that they have been translated to matter; this effects the postulation of life in its completeness, and checks its evolution. Matter, it would appear, has no evolution[2]: it is a fixed and definite thing: life with

its faculty of consciousness has either used it for a definite purpose, or come in contact with it accidentally.

The two aims of Jain philosophy are to regulate, if not to check, this flowing in of *karmic* matter; and then by a process which it calls discrimination (*viveka*), prevent it getting settled round life

It is this settling (*bandha*), or fixation of matter, which binds life, forcing it into *karmic* bodies—that is, bodies formed from *karmic* matter as opposed to static matter—when life loses more and more its volition, being, at last, completely bound by matter.

This binding may remain for ever but, pure thought, which is the prelude to purification, has the power of loosening *karmic* particles, and finally shaking them off altogether when, the text says, the soul shines in all its original luminosity, grandeur and glory

This thesis is very rational; for, the answer to the question as to how this metaphysical postulate has been formed, is, that the knowledge has been imparted by liberated souls.

In the process of life purifying itself from *karmic* matter, certain higher lives have been evolved; and they have been the teachers of the world in this respect amongst others.

These liberated souls are not creators, though they are worthy of worship; because, positing the thesis that one becomes the thing on which one meditates, these liberated souls are to be the 'summum bonum' of every man's existence one may even meditate on them as one's own self.

All the virtues, which, even in man, we cognise as of divine origin, are in these liberated souls in their fullness, and, from time to time, they take on forms to return to the earth to help, to teach and save souls

Matter, says Jain philosophy, is as real as the souls or life. It differs from the latter and its difference is, that, whilst matter has no consciousness, the soul has consciousness.

The second postulate of matter is energy.

The principle of motion was posited in Mahâvîra's philosophy from its very inception: that matter contained in itself the power of motion, and, once moved, would continue to move until something stopped it, when it remained in its third division of rest.

So matter possesses, at one and the same time, two innate properties: one of movement, the other of rest; and it is these two principles, inherent in matter, that have introduced order into the universes.

The fourth postulate is time.

Time in Mahâvîra's philosophy is a postulate necessary for the understanding of growth and existence.

It is a condition for the change in matter: matter, being as eternal as life, may, by its inner energy, change; but its total quantity never increases or decreases.

Matter has existence, and to determine this existence time is essential.

Existence means production, decay and re-appearance; and Mahâvîra insists that existence holds these three on a fourth point-time.

This fourth is ever the same, unchangeable and eternal; but the appearance associated with time are for ever changing.

And space, or infinity, which is the fourth postulate of matter, but, which the writer has allocated for reasons of her own to the fifth place, is the medium for the flow of matter and soul; and, again, interesting to note in the light of recent research that, not only is a large part of this space empty of matter proper, but, on its outer fringe, it is void of life as well as matter.

Let us re-capitulate the main theories: space is the field for the play of energies. These are latent in matter which, however, is normally static.

Is this energy, that is posited latent in matter as a property, released by contact with life?

Life, the philosophy insists, is contaminated by its association with matter, which, it says, has flowed into it through the medium of space—accidentally in the first instance, the text would suggest, and this might well be so; for, if life has consciousness, it must surely have realized the posited bondage to come.

One of the properties of life is radiance; and it loses this when it builds for itself a *karmic* body, or form, from matter at its disposal.

Now, though karmic matter becomes fixed through the activities and emotions of life, by an understanding of its true nature, it adopts the mental attitude of stopping the in-flow of

new matter, and the *karmic* matter, already settled, disintegrates with time: whereupon, the true nature of life, or soul, is again, realized: radiant, possessed of infinite greatness and glory—omniscience itself.

This last form was presumably its original form.

Once the danger of contact with matter is realized, and the bonds broken, and life freed of matter, the liberated souls are liberated for ever.

Could it be that to the first life or soul, there was denied that one knowledge of all—the knowledge of the danger? And that for final liberation experience was essential? And could it be that life in its pristine form has, by very knowledge of life that has been sullied, suffered, cleaned and rested, learnt, too, of the danger, and the means of its avoidance, from those liberated lives who have themselves suffered and achieved; who have discovered too the means to keep clear from that which tarnished, to retain their purity: even learnt to use matter wisely?

Or is life, too, in a process of evolution, rising from the smallness of the one sense consciousness to higher and higher senses at last to god-hood?

Both thoughts are sublime: Jainism favours the second.

SUMMING UP

THERE is very strong reason to believe that the Upanishads have indented for their philosophy on Mahâvîra; and that the major faults of the former are due to their desire to plant, unsuccessfully, their pet thesis of one-ness (*Advaitism*)—spirit being all—on to the duality (*Dvaitism*)—spirit and matter—of Jainism.

The philosophy of Mahâvîra is an almost perfect one, and the flaws in it are due rather to the largeness of the subject discussed than to the philosophy itself.

It is a live philosophy; ennobling and re-assuring.

It puts a supreme and beautiful value on life believing that when its fragments are disintegrated to a point almost of nothingness, there is danger to that small evolution losing itself for ever.

This philosophy gives a sanctity to life and its preservation. This sanctity of life, it insists, is the highest religion—the only evolution

Somewhere, it believes, the balance has been broken and this has led to the pain of life, and until the balance be again restored it will continue measuring wrongly, and pain will persist.

For the threads of life, it believes, run from the lowest to the highest, and when the meshes are broken, chaos rushes in to enlarge the break.

One might conjecture that it was through this one broken strand of life that matter took possession of the soul, and, till the web has been made one and whole again, the struggle of what we know as mortal existence must continue.

This philosophy is optimistic: for it believes, too, that in the end, right, that is, life, souls, spirit, must triumph over matter; for once consciousness is restored to life in the form of right knowledge, matter has no longer any power over the soul.

---

1 The reader should remember that life and souls are the same in Jain ethics; but the writer will, from now onwards, use the word life as being the more philosophic one

2 Modern science tends to posit a radiation of matter, but this radiation might easily be life in its process of disentangling itself from matter. Indeed, Jain Philosophy posits radiation as a property of life.

•••••

23

LIFE OF LORD MAHÂVÎRA AND HIS TEACHING

—Dr. K. R. Chandra, M.D. Ph. D.

It is held that Jainism is one of the oldest religions of India. It belongs to the *Sramana* fold that developed and flourished in East India. This system of thought was popularised by others also, namely, the *Sânkhyas, Âjîvikas, Buddhists* etc. Here we are concerned with the last prophet of the Jainas who belonged to the *Sramana* school.

As Jain tradition goes, there have been twenty-four *Tîrthankaras.* Rsabha was the first among them He wandered from place to place, naked, with matted hair on his head. The references to the *Vâtarasana munis, sisna devas* and to Rsabha in the Vedic literature and the Puranas prove that the Jain tradition is corroborated by non-Jain sources. Nemi was the twenty-second *Tîrthankara.* He was the cousin brother of Krsna Parsva was the twenty-third *Tîrthnkara.* He has now been accepted as an historical figure. The last *Tîrthankara* was Vardhamana Mahavira who was contemporary of Lord Buddha and of Gosala, the leader of the *Ajivika* sect.

Mahavira was born in the royal family of king Siddartha of Kundapura, also known as Ksatriya Kundapura, a suburb of Vaisali situated in the Videha country, now in the north Bihar. He was a prince of the Jñatr clan. His mother Trisala, also known as Priyakari was a princess, a sister of Cetaka. Cetaka was the head of Licchavi Repulic and was the President of the onfederacy which comprised of the Licchavis and Mallakis and the *ganarajas* of Kasi-kosala. Mahavira's elder brother was Nandivardhana who married a daughter of Cetaka. Srenika Bimbisara, the mighty king of the Magadha country was also related to Mahavira as he had married

Cellana, a sister of Cetaka, Suparsva was Mahavira's uncle. Mahavira married (according to one tradition) princess Yasoda of the Kaundiny a family. Mahavira had a daughter Priyadarsana, also known as Anujja, who was married to prince Jamali, the son of Sudarsana, also known as Anujja, who was married to prince Jamali, the son of Sudarsana, the sister of Mahavira. Priyadarsana had a daughter, Yasomati or Sesavati.

Mahavira was known by several names. At his birth he was given the name Vardhamana because with his birth the wealth of his family was augmented. He was also known as Jñatrputra because of his clan. Again, he was called Vaisalika on account of his birth-place. He was Videhajatya as he was born in the Videha country and was popularly known as Mahavira since he overcame all fears and dangers and put up patiently with all hardships and even calamities. He was also called Sramana, Mahamuni, Kusala, Sanmati, Jinavira and Mahatapasvi for his various other qualities and virtues.

Though all the princely comforts were at his disposal, he did not like to lead a worldly life. His soul was hankering after that higher truth which could bring a permanent solution to the problems of here and hereafter. He, therefore, wanted to renounce the world, but tradition has it that he did not like to cause the slightest grief to his parents, and he decided to leave the household only after the death of his parent. But his elders would not allow him to renounce the world even after his parents were no more and hence he deferred his initiation further by two years. During this period he lived a life of piety, observing celibacy. With compassion he offered gifts to the poor and the needy. At the age of thirty he renounced the world and became a monk.

His whole career hereafter was marked by severe penances. During this period of twelve years he observed fasts of various denominations and durations, ranging from two days to six months and the period during which he took food would hardly come to one year. at the time of breaking his fasts and accepting alms he did not make any distinction between the families of higher and lower status. He accepted food from the Brahmins, ksatriyas, farmers, cowherds as well as from other householders, and it did not concern him whether he got sumptuous or dry, fresh or stale food. He spent all this dry, fresh or stale food. He spent all this

period in deep meditation, observing various postures of *Yoga*. He wandered from place to place in the region of the Gangetic plains. Among the various places which he visited and where he spent the period of four months of rainy season were Asthikagrama, Nalanda, Rajargha, Sravasti, Vaisali, Alabhika, the Radha country, now in Bengal, Vanijyagrama, Tosali, Kausambi, Varanasi, Mithila, Pava etc.

He had multifarious experiences during all these twelve years. He endured many hardships and calamities with patience. He had great compassion for living beings. At Moraka settlement he was given shelter by the head of the *Tanasa* ascetics in his hermitage. Due to shortage of fodder some cows had begun to take for their food the thatch of the very cottage where Mahavira was staying. Even then, he remained in meditation and did not chase away the cows and deprive them of their food. This behaviour of Mahavira was not liked by the head of the hermitage and so he abused Mahavira this incident moved his heart and as a consequence he resolved not to stay with anyone when his stay proved so unpleasant to others. He decided not to take help from others and to observe silence.

The incident at Moraka had made him realize the obstacles inherent in dependency on others. So he decided to become independent in respect of the places of shelter. And throughout his later wanderings he did not seek shelter with anyone. While going from place to place he used to stay in groves, gardens, shrines dedicated to popular deities, workshops, deserted houses, desolate places, and under trees, etc. Thus he did not have to accept anybody's favour and was free from any hindrance in his ceaseless efforts for spiritual accomplishment (*Sadhana*). He even gave up the use of utensils and started taking food in his bare palms because he wanted to become free and independent in all respects.

Fearlessness was a chief attribute with him. Fear leads to so many unfitting action and it destroys freedom. In the vicinity of Uttaravacala there was a big forest in which there lived a poisonous serpent. Cowherds requested Mahavira not to proceed that way, but, confident of his power, he did go and faced the danger. The serpent did bite him but he remained steadfast in his meditation and he emerged victorious.

The other qualities that he possessed were forbearance and tolerance, magnanimity and forgiveness. On the occasion of giving up the life of a householder he embraced the permanent vow of *samayika*, i.e. equanimity towards all living beings. During his wanderings from place to place he was met by many unsocial elements whom he put up with silently; he would not resist even when they interfered with him actively. As a naked monk, because he had given up the clothes too as he did not like to have the least *parigraha* (possessions), he became a target of attack from many ignorant people. In the Radha country (a part of Bengal), people pelted him with stones, beat him with sticks and set dogs after him, but he would not swerve from his path. As a stranger, he was sometimes caught by the city-guards on being taken for a spy or a secret agent of their enemies. Quite novel and peculiar were the ways of his *sadhana* and naturally people looked on him with suspicion. Sometimes decoits and thieves, when caught red-handed, tried to implicate Mahavira in their crime for their own safety. And Mahavira lost in contemplation would not answer any question addressed to him by the king's men, and would by rounded up. His silence brought him many hardships. At Kumaragrama a cowherd beat him on the suspicion of his having stolen his bullocks. On a similar occasion, at Chammani another cowherd struck wooden nails into Mahavira's ears as he did not answer a querry about his missing bullocks.

After a prolonged exertion in the form of deep meditations and severe austerities for over twelve years he attained perfect knowledge (*kevala-jñana*) on the tenth day of the bright fortnight of the month of Vaisakha, outside Jrmbhikagrama on the northern bank of river Rjuvalika, in north Bihara. Now the question arose as to whom he should first explain his doctrine. It was not possible for the common men to understand it. At that time some eleven great Brahmin scholars from Magadha, Videha, Kosala, Vatsa etc., the then states of north India had gathered with their hundreds of pupils at Pava Madyama to attend the ritual of a great sacrifice (*mahayajña*), Mahavira found it to be the most suitable occasion for explaining his tenets. He walked over to that place and delivered his sermon to them. Those eleven scholars of the *Vaidika* schools had various doubts and they put a number of questions to Mahavira and he resolved their doubts, and explained to them,

to their utmost satisfaction, his doctrine of multiple view-points (*anekantavada*). All of them were convinced and they, along with their pupils, were converted and they became the first and foremost disciples, i.e. *Ganadharas* of Mahavira. Many others became his lay-votaries (*upasakas*). Thus he established his four-fold order (*caturvidha-samgha*) comprising of male and female disciples and lay-votaries.

Before attaining perfect knowledge he was wandering alone and keeping silence. But now onwards he went preaching his religion from place to place with his large following. He adopted the language of the masses called Ardhamagadhi, a Prakrit dialect, for he knew that the general populace was not learned in Sanskrit, the language of the scholars. In popularizing his doctrine he obtained great support from the then-ruling families of Rajagrha, Campa, Kausambi, Avanti etc., who were related to him from his mother's side. Besides that, his great compassion, reticence and self-discipline created a great impression on the people of all classes and creeds.

Among his followers there were kings, queens, tribal chiefs, princes, princesses, merchants, farmers, potters and *candelas* (lowborn). Brahmins also joined his Order. Among his well-known disciples were King Siva of Hastinapura, formerly a mendicant, *Anarya* king Kirataraja of Kotivarsa; Queens like Siva of Ujjayini and Mrgavati of Kausambi; Princesses like Jayanti of Kausambi and Candana of Campa; and Merchants like Setha Sudarsana of Vanijyagrama and Poggala of Alabhiya. His other followers were Gangeya, a monk of the tradition of *Tirthankara* Parsva; Skandaka, a Brahmin mendicant of Rajagrha; Metarya, an untouchable, and so on. His lay votaries were Ananda, a millionaire agriculturist from Vanijyagrama; Varuna, a warrior of Vaisali; Setha Sudarsana of Rajagrha; Saddalaputra, a rich potter of Polasaputra, formerly a follower of the *Ajivika* sect, and so on. Believers of his faith were King Srenika Bimbisara of Rajagrha; Kalodayi, a heretical house-holder; Ambada, a Brahmin mendicant, and so on. Besides them, the Licchavis and the Mallakis were also his followers.

Mahavira walked from place to place as a peripatetic teacher for thirty years and spread the gospel of *Ahimsa* (non-violence) throughout the plains of north India from Kampily- apura (or Sindhu – Sauvira as one tradition goes) to Rajagrha. At the age

of seventy-two he attained *Nirvana*-emancipation at Pava. On that occasion the eighteen confederate kings of Kasi and Kosala, the nine Mallakis and the nine Licchavis showed their love and respect for the Master by instituting illuminations on the fifteenth day of the dark half of the month of Kartika. 2500 years have passed since, and Dipavali is being celebrated every year with illuminating lights in the memory of that great soul—MAHAVIRA It is well-known that Mahavira did not found a new religion. He got the heritage from the previous *Tirthankaras*. Parsva was his immediate predecessor. Mahavira had great respect for him. It is also recorded that the parents of Mahavira were the Parsva's followers Parsva had taught *caturyama dharma* (consisting of four vows) while Mahavira further bifurcated one of the vows and taught *pañca-vrata dharma* (of five vows). We come across lively discussions between the followers of Parsva on one hand and Mahavira as well as his followers on the other where it is explained in clear terms that there was, in essence, no difference between the teachings of these two prophets.

Jainism was formerly known as *Nirgrantha" dharma*. Mahavira was famous as a *Nirgrantha* because he had freed himself from all the ties and entanglements, internal and external. He was also called a *Jina* as he had conquered all the passions (*kasaya*) and later on his teachings became popular by the name of Jainism.

Jainism does not believe in a creator-God, that controls the destinies of men. Whims of a personal God have no place in it. Man is not dependent on any external agency. He is quite independent and his own acts (*kriya* or *karma*) alone are responsible for his bondage; he is the sole master of his salvation God- head is the ideal. A man attains it when he becomes perfect by following the prescribed ethical code.

Jainism equally denies fatalism- *niyativada* of Gosalaka who preached that there was a fixed order of things and salvation came of its own accord when that order was complete, In the Upasakadasanga Mahavira explains the invalidity of this doctrine in a very simple way. He emphasises that action, exertion and manly strength (*utthana, karma, bala, virya, purusakara, parakrama*) are the main factors responsible for salvation. He asks Saddalaputra as to how his potter's wares are made. He answers

that they are made by his action and exertion. In reply to another question he answers that he will beat or kill the miscreant who steals his wares or plays mischief with his wife. Then Mahavira points out that if all is pre-determined there is no point in taking action against the miscreant. Thus Saddalaputra realises the non-applicability of determinism or fatalism.

Mahavira preached that the life of a human being was the most important not only of all the rest of lower creatures but also of all the celestial beings -*devas*. It is only the human being who can exert of his own free-will and attain emancipation.

According to Mahavira there are two fundamental substances, living and non-living, i.e. *Jiva* and *Ajiva*. *Jiva*. *Atma* or soul is the embodiment of consciousness and where there is no consciousness, we have *Ajiva*, the non-soul. A substance is a permanent entity which undergoes change in its various modifications which are destroyed and created a new every moment A substance is never destroyed but its forms change This is the realistic point of view adopted by Mahavira. He denies both the absolute momentariness of the Buddha and the absolute permanency of *Upanisad*. As such he is a realist and not an idealist. This multiple outlook of his is called *Anekantavada* or *Syadvada*. This we come across at various places in the scriptures-(*AgamaSastra*).

In a discussion between ascetic Roha and Mahavira, the former asked whether the hen or the egg came first. Mahavira reply was that none of them can be called first. Because each is the cause of other· both have continuity from the beginningless time. To Jamali's question whether the world is eternal (*anania*) or transient (*santa*), Mahavira's answer was that from the point of view of substance it is eternal and from that of modification it is transient. To it we can add the discussion that was held between Jayanti and Mahavira on the questions of metaphysics and ethics.

At the time of Mahivira there was a great turmoil in the religious and philosophical world. Various religious leaders were: engaged in search of truth. Each maintained his own point of view disregarding others' view-points. It led to controversies. Nobody would tolerate the views of others. This state of affairs had a great effect on the mind of Mahavira and he found the way out. He would consider all the points of view and would never

lay stress only on one aspect. His method of tolerance brought about re-conciliation of various one-sided philosophical points of view. This is revealed in his first discussions with eleven *Ganadharas*-the first and foremost disciples, Gautama etc., before: their conversion to bis faith. They raised their doubts on the basis of the Vedas and Upanisads, and Mahavira resolved. these in his own *anekanta* way. This was his popular mode of discussion. Other religious leaders like Kalodayi, Udaka etc. were also convinced of the pbilosohpy of Mahavira which said that intellectual tolerance was the right way of understanding various aspects of a problem.

He explained that the creatures were made up of two entities soul and matter or *Atma* and *Pudgala*. The physical body was different from the soul. The *Karma* also was seperate from *Jiva* or *karma*. *Jiva* was bound by the *karmas* and it experienced the fruits of its own *karmas*. He taught that the *karmas* should be destroyed for the liberation of the soul and that came by performing austerities and practising ethical discipline.

Mahavira believed in the sanctity of life in whatever form it might be. Different kinds of creatures were embodiments of similar souls in varying spiritual gradations, therefore, he laid emphasis on showing equal regard for all forms of life. Life was dear to all. Pain and pleasure were equally experienced by all No one liked pain or injury or violence. Hence, one should not cause pain to other creatures and one should always follow the principle of *Ahinsa* (non-violence). Thus in the realm of ethics, behaviour or conduct also he taught the principle of tolerance. He exemplified it with his own practices during the period of his Siddhana-accomplishment. Some times he was turned out because he did not chase away the cows from the hermitage. At places cowherds beat him; insects and gnats troubled him; thieves involved him and kings imprisoned him. Ignorant people pelted him with stones and set dogs after him. But he tolerated all the hardships with patience and never flinched or uttered any harsh word against them.

Always to speak the truth (*satya*) and never to steal (*acaurya*) were other ingredients of the code of conduct he preached. They were essential for good neighbourliness, social security, national solidarity and international brotherhood. Sexual restraint

brahmacarya was another essential, the lack of which led to many other evils and thwarted social progress and spiritual advancement.

Aparigraha, the vow of non-possession or curtailment of one's desires was equally important. The more the desires and possessions, the more the delusion This meant an increase of worldly burdens and complications; it hindered spiritual progress; it impaired the freedom of the soul. The craving for worldly possessions invites many evils. At any given time the wealth and the economic resources of a nation are limited. What is the best way for a fair distribution of wealth? In the light of the teachings of Lord Mahavıra the solution consists in putting voluntary restrictions on one's desires for possessions. Otherwise there is no end to the multiplication of one's desires. This would result in an unequal distribution of wealth among the people and would lead to suffering among them. Today what we call Socialism or Marxism also preaches a similar doctrine as far as the economic aspect of worldly life is concerned. But there is a great difference in the means advocated Mahavira taught tolerance and *Ahimsa* and therefore, he preached that one should voluntarily curtail one's possessions, whereas an ideology like Marxism lays stress on force to be used by the State or Government; it does not believe in *Ahimsa.*

Every age has its own problems At the time of Mahavira, the killing of animals in the name of religion was rampant Mahavira raised a strong voice against this cult and preached the doctrine of *Ahimsa* and compassion. Ever rsince then, the doctrine of *Ahimsa* gained everlasting importance Today there is an all round demand for socıal and economic justice. It is quite a well established fact that Mahavira never considered the *varna,* the caste as a barrier to admittance to his Order (*samgha*) or to spiritual progress.

As regards economic justice, the conduct prescribed for a householder is worth consideration. The twelve Anga-books (*dvadasanga*) forming the oldest part of the Jain canonical literature contain the authentic teachings of Mahavira. The seventh Anga, namely, Upasakadasa is entirely devoted to the description of the conduct to be followed by the householder. There we come across the fifth vow to be observed by householders. It is that of curtailing one's desires and possessions: commercial, professional as well

as domestic (*icchavidhiparimana* and *upabhogaparibh-ogaparimana*).

In Jain terminology; if one wants to know the reality one should look at the things from four points of view: substance (*dravya*), place (*ksetra*), time (*kala*) and condition (*bhava*). Otherwise there will be no proper assessment of the things, and therefore, no way out of confusion. Hence, the fifth vow of limitation of possessions, in other words, of controlling of one's avarice (*lobha*), has a great significance today, and, if observed honestly, it can be helpful in solving our problems without any violence (*himsa*).

Mahavira's following were of three types—ascetics (*sramana*), lay-votaries (*upasaka*) and believers (*sraddha*). Ascetics renounced the world and followed the vows in entirety. They were to devote themselves to learning, austerities, meditation and teaching. The laity or householders, while following their multifarious worldly professions, were also required to observe the vows but partially. The believers were those who had faith in the philosophy and doctrines of Mahavira but could not observe any vow. These were three cadres of his followers. It shows that the principle of tolerance was adopted everywhere.

In the ascetic order also we find that the idea of liberality is dominant. Mahavira's disciples were of two types, naked and robed (*Digambara* and *Svetambara*). Though Mahavira himself wandered naked, he enjoined upon his disciples that those who were unable to follow his hard way of life could go clothed. In the canonical literature these two types of his disciples are known as *Jinakalpikas* and *Sthaviras*. At the time of discussion between Kesin of the line of Parsva and Gautama of that of Mahavira, the latter clarifies that in the teachings of Mahavira external signs whether one puts on garments or not, are not important. It is the *Samyak Darsana, Jñana* and *Caritra* (right faith, right knowledge and right conduct) that lead to enancipation. Truly, it is said that attachment and aversion *(raga-dvesa)* are to be subjugated and one has to purify himself internally Without which mere external restrictions or renunciations have no meaning. In essence to be a *Vitaraga* one has to conquer anger, pride, deceit, avarice and delusion (*krodha, mana, maya, lobha and moha*) and that is the ideal of Godhead (*Vitaraga*).

There was no compulsion and one was free to lead his life according to his own conviction, strength and ability. The instance df Gathapati Ananda is before us. He was a multi-millionaire. He had many farms for cultivation, also a fleet of ploughs and bullocks. He approached Mahavira and requested to him that as he was unable to accept monk-hood, he be allowed to become his lay-votary. Mahavira's reply was of consent—*yatha'sukham*, i.e. as you please. He did not ask him to renounce the world.

While accepting the vow of non-possession (*Aparigraha*) Ananda curtailed all his possessions in the form of coins, cattle, ploughs, land, carts, carriages and even articles of daily use. A.S already meationed he was a big agriculturist. Here the point is: why did Mahavira not ask him to renounce the profession of agriculture. Rsabha, the first *Tirthankara* had himself taught the people to cultivate land. Ancient preachers (*Acaryas*) have explained agriculture as an Aryan profession (*krya-karma*). But to our surprise we find that in the subsequent centuries, gradually, this profession has been looked down upon with contempt. This calls for a revival of the sanctity of this profession. Agriculture is the real culture. Without it there will be no food and no clothing. Vegetarianism is impossible without agriculture; for, vegetarians are in a way *ahimsavadins* as they do not eat meat which involves killing (*himsa*). Had it been a sinful profession Mahivira would have certainly asked Ananda to give it up and to invest all his wealth in business and trade, Some people today consider Business (*vyapara*) as the only pious profession, though this stand is absolutely not correct Any profession is pious provided its ethics is riot flouted. It can not be considered as ethically, morally or religiously sound if one works against the values of public life and accumulates wealth by unfair means, by the non-payment of various state-taxes, by indulging in the acts of supply of adulterated commodities, by profiteering, by creating artificial scarcity etc. These acts give rise to public hardships, corruption *(bhrastacara)* etc. and lead to transgression of the fundamental vows of non-acquisition, non-stealing, truthfulness and non-violence. In the scriptures it is plainly stated that a house-holder (*upasaka*) should not be betrayed into any sort of transgression by committing the offences such as falsification of documents (*kutalekha karana*), receipt of stolen property (*stenahrta*), smuggling and non-payment

of the state-taxes—due (*viruddharajyatikramana*), use of false weights and measures (*kutatulakutamana*) and indulgence in adulteration of commodities (*tatpratirupakavyavahara*). It is quite clear that an industry, trade, business, profession or service is not pious in itself but it depends largely on the way an individual conducts himself in his dealings with others.

There is hardly a single field of human life and activity which can be said to be free from corruption (*bhrastacara*) today. Signs of moral turpitude are to be seen in all walks of life : whether public or private, political or governmental, educational or even religious. In-spite of big strides made by modern science and a number of means of comforts. and conveniences pressed into the services of mankind, the ideals of peace and happiness. still elude us. The source of this evil is blind materialism, which alone is to blame for this misfortune and suffering. Therefore, the need of the hour is to purge the whole atmosphere—political and social, economic and religious of this prevailing ill. This can be done effectively and permanently only by putting voluntary control over our desires (*icchavidhiparimana*) and passions (*kasayamgraha*) and by following the sacred vows prescribed by Lord Mahavira. Self-restraint (*samyama*) and self-discipline (*anusasana*) are non-violent (*ahimsatmaka*) means and they have a permanent value. If these virtues are observed honestly and willingly there would hardly arise any necessity for putting external curbs or restraints on our freedom of action or even of speech. Restraints of thought, speech and action (*manogupti, vacanagupti, kayagupti*) are to come from within and are prescribed by Jainism as a part of the ethical code. According to Mahavira's teachings all external checks serve to create only atmosphere of fear and destroy the sense of freedom which is so dear to every human being. Lord Mahavira taught that freedom and restraint should always go hand in hand because fear and force are not helpful in attaining our ultimate goal.

When there are national and internaltional disputes, regional and provincial controversies, communal and linguistic-quarrels, economic inequality and social injustices, and even lack of endurance for other religious people, the **Philosophy of Tolerance** in the realms of **Intellect** and **Behaviour** embodied in the doctrines of *syadvada* (relativity) and *ahimsa* (non-violence)

should be properly understood and sincerely practised. Respect for life, human welfare and tolerance for the humanist philosophy. If we follow this faithfully we will succeed to be world-citizens and lovers of peaceful co-existence.

24

LORD MAHÂVÎRA MESSAGE TO GAUTAMA

—R. B. Pandey

II. 10. iv. The Leaf of The Tree[1]

1. As the fallow leaf of the tree falls to the ground, when its days are gone, even so the life of men (will come to its close); Gautama, be careful all the while !

2. As a dew-drop dangling on the top of a blade of kusagrass last but a short time, even so the life of men; Gautama; be careful all the while !

3. As life is so fleet and existence so precarious, wipe off the sins you ever committed, Gautama be careful all the while !

4. A rare chance, in lthe long course of time, is human birth for a living being; hard are the consequences of actions; Gautama, be careful all the while !

5. When the soul has once got into an earth-body,[2] it may remain in the same state as long as an Asamkhya;[3] Gautama, be careful all the while !

6. When a soul has once got into a fire-body it may remain in the same state as long as Asamkhya; Gautama, be careful all the while !

7. When a soul has once got into a fire-body it may remain in the same state as long as Asamkhya; Gautama, be careful all the while !

8. When the soul has once got into a wind-body it may remain in the same state as long as Asamkhya; Gautama, be careful all the while !

9. When the soul has once got into a vegetable-body, it remains long in that state, for an endless time, after which its lot is not much bettered,[4] Gautama, be careful all the while !

10. When the soul has once got into a body of a Dvindriya (i.e. a being possesing two organs of sense), it may remain in the same state as long as a pperiod called samkhyeya.[5] Gautama, be careful all the while !

11. When the soul has once got into a body of a Trindriya (i.e. a being possessing three organs of sense), it may remain in the same state as long as a period called samkhyeya. Gautama, be careful all the while !

12. When the soul has once got into a body of a pankendriya (i.e. a being possesing five organs of sense), it may remain in the same state as long as a pperiod called samkhyeya. Gautama, be careful all the while !

13. When the soul has once got into a body of a Pankendriya (i.e. a being possessing five organs of sense), it may remain in the same state as long as seven or eight birth; Gautama, be carefull all the while !

14. When the soul has once got into the body of a god or of a denizen of hell, it may remain in that state once whole life; Gautama, be careful all the while !

15. Thus the sloul which suffers for its carelessness, is driven about in the samara by its good and bad karman; Gautama, be careful all the while !

16. Though one be born as a man, it is a rare chance to become an Arya; for many are the Dasyus and Mlekkhas; Gautama, be careful all the while !

17. Though one be born as an Arya, it is a rare chance to possess all five organs of sense; for we see many who lack one organ or other; Gautama, be careful all the while !

18. Though he may posses all five organs of sense, still it is a rare chance to be instructed in the best Law; for people follow heretical teachers; Gautama, be careful all the while !

19. Though he may have been instructed in the right Law, still it is a rare chance to believe in it; for many people are heretics; Gautama, be careful all the while !

20. Though one believe in the Law, he will rarely practise it; for people are engrossed by pleasures; Gautama, be careful all the while !

21.When your body grows old, and your hair turns white, the power of your ears decreases, Gautama, be careful all the while !

22. When your body grows old, and your hair turns white, the power of your eyes decreases. Gautama, be careful all the while !

23.When your body grows old, and your hair turns white, the power of your nose decreases.

24. When your body grows old, and your hairs turns white, the power of your tongue decreases.

25. When your body grows old, and your hairs turns white, the power of your touch decreases.

26. When your body grows old, and your hairs turns white, all your power decreases.

27. Despondency, the king's evil, cholera, mortal diseases of many kinds befall you; your body wastes and decays; Gautama, be careful all the while !

28 Cast aside from you all attachments, as the (leaves of) a lotus let drop off the autumanal[6] water, exempt from every attachment, Gautama, be careful all the while !

29. Give up your wealth and your wife; you have entered the state of the houseless; do not, as a were, return to your vomit; Gautama, be careful all the while !

30. Leave your friends and relations, the large fortune you have amassed; do not desire sthem a second time; Gautama, be careful all the while !

31. There is now no Jina, but there is a highly esteemed guide to show the way; now being on the right path; Gautama, be careful all the while !

32. Now you have entered on the path from which the thorns have been cleared, the great path; walk in the right path; Gautama, be careful all the while !

33. Do not get into an uneven road like a weak burned-bearer; for you will repent of it afterwards; Gautama, be careful all the while !

34. You have crossed the great ocean; why do you halt so near the shore ? make haste to get on the other side; Gautama, be careful all the while !

35. Going through the same religious practices as perfected saints, you will reach the world of perfection, Gautama, where there is safety and perfect happiness; Gautama, be careful all the while !

36. The enlightened[7] and liberate monk should control himself, whether he be in a village or a town and he should preach to all[8] the road of peace; Gautama, be careful all the while !

37. Having heard the Buddha's[9] well-delivered sermon, adorned by illustrations, Gautama cut off love and hatred and reached perfection. Thous I say.

References

1 This is a sermon delivered by Mahâvîra to his disciple Indrabhuti, who belonged to Gotama Gotra In the commentary a lengthy legend is given how Gautama came to want this instruction
Mahâvîra was preaching in the city a Apapa where Indraphuti, a Brahmin scholar, had come to attend a large animal sacrifice He wanted to know why Mahâvîra opposed such a traditional sacrifice, but in the course of their discussion he was won over by Mahâvîra's gentle discourse on ahimsa Thereafter Indrabhuti became Mahâvîra's disciple His three brothers and 500 student also became Mahâvîra's followers At the same time, Princess Candana, daughter of Dadhivahan, King of Campa, entered Mahâvîra's order of ascetics and became the head of the nuns.

2 Verse 5-9 treat of the ekendriyas or beings which possess but one organ of sense, that of touch A full description of them as well as of the dvindriyas, &c is given in the last lecture.

3 The periods called asamkhya are measured by utarpins and avasrpins and avasarpinis which correspond to the kalpas of the Hindus, but greatly exaggerated An samkhya is the longest time (ukkosam = utkarsham)which a soul may be doomed to live in earth-bodies, see below XXXVI, 81 ff

4. This is according to the commentary, the meaning of duranta.

5. A samhijji, i .e samkhyeya, is a period which can be measured by thousands of years.

6 This attribute is here given to 'water', because in autumn the water becomes pure, and even the purest water has no hold upon the leaves of a lotus, thus a saint should give up even the best and dearest attachment

7 Buddha.

8. Buhae = vrimhayet, literally, propagate

9 Here the word buddha is used as a title, but its use is very restricted, scarely going beyound that of a comon epdithet. This is just what we otherwise should have to assume in order to explain the use by the Bauddhas of that world to denote the founder of their sect In the sutrakritanga II, 6,28 Buddha, in the plural, actually denotes the prophets of the Buddhists